

AN
EXAMINATION
OF THE
FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CHAPTERS
OF
Mr. GIBBON'S HISTORY
OF THE
Decline and Fall of the ROMAN EMPIRE.

In which HIS VIEW of the
PROGRESS of the CHRISTIAN RELIGION
Is shewn to be founded on the MISREPRESENTATION
of the AUTHORS he cites :

AND
Numerous Instances of his INACCURACY and PLAGIA-
RISM are produced.

By HENRY EDWARDS DAVIS, B.A.
OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

"When at every Step—I find you misquoting the Words, and misrepresenting
the Sense of the Authors, it is not in my Power (I confess) to think you a
fair and impartial Writer." *Bp. PEARCE's Reply to Dr. MIDDLETON.*

"Ne gloriari libeat alienis bonis." *PRÆDRUS.*

L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR J. DODSLEY, IN PALL-MALL.
MDCCLXXVIII.

EXAMINATION

OF THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN

THE HISTORY OF THE

UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

AND

THE HISTORY OF THE

INDIAN TRIBES

OF THE

WESTERN HEMISPHERE



PRINTED BY

JOHN BENTLEY

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE

1871

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE whole of this work was printed off before I perused Dr. *Chelsum's* second edition of his *Remarks*, and Mr. *Burgh's* "Inquiry into the Belief of the first Christians," &c. But though I now find, that some few of my observations had occurred to these gentlemen; so extensive a list of Mr. G.'s *misrepresentations, inaccuracies, and plagiarisms* remained untouched by them, or by others, that, I flatter myself, the world will not consider this publication as unnecessary.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE whole of this work was printed off before I received Dr. Clarke's second edition of his Remarks, and Mr. Burgh's Inquiry into the Rights of the Christian. The former I now add, that some few of my observations had occurred to this gentleman, to extend a list of his. The new edition, however, was not yet published, and remained unaltered in the press, or by others, that I later upon the work with me, and the publisher is now printing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION - - - - - Page i

MISREPRESENTATION of Authors.

<i>Diodorus Siculus</i>	- - - - -	9
<i>Justin</i>	- - - - -	10
<i>Dion Cassius</i>	- - - - -	11. 82
<i>Universal History</i>	- - - - -	13
<i>Le Clerc</i>	- - - 19. 101—104. 111—114	
<i>Josephus</i>	- - - - -	20
<i>Tertullian</i>	- - - - -	25—40
<i>Sulpicius Severus</i>	- - - - -	40
<i>Fra Paolo</i>	- - - - -	43
<i>Clemens</i>	- - - - -	44
<i>Irenæus</i>	- - - - -	46
<i>Cyprian</i>	- - - - - 47—53. 109, 110	
<i>Origen</i>	- - - - -	53—60
<i>Eusebius</i>	- - - - -	60—70
<i>Justin Martyr</i>	- - - - -	71
<i>Optatus</i>	- - - - -	73
<i>Lactantius</i>	- - - - -	75—81
<i>Epiæctetus</i>	- - - - -	84
<i>Marcus Antoninus</i>	- - - - -	86
<i>Pliny</i>	- - - - -	87
<i>Orosius</i>	- - - - -	88
<i>Bayle and Fabricius</i>	- - - - -	90
<i>Grotius</i>	- - - - -	91—94
<i>Mosheim</i>	- - 95—97. 104—107. 114—132	
<i>Bossuet</i>	- - - - -	98, 99
<i>Ignatius</i>	- - - - -	100, 101
<i>Dupin</i>	- - - - -	132—136

CONTENTS.

	Page
<i>Tillemont</i> - - - - -	136—139
<i>Gregory of Tours</i> - - - - -	137—138
<i>Pagi</i> - - - - -	140
<i>Lord Lyttelton</i> - - - - -	140, 141
<i>Proofs of INACCURACY</i> - - - - -	141—156
<i>Additions and alterations in Mr. Gibbon's third edition</i> - - - - -	142, 143
<i>Miscellaneous remarks</i> - - - - -	156—167

Instances of PLAGIARISM.

<i>From Middleton</i> - - - - -	169—185. 271, 272
<i>Barbeyrac</i> - - - - -	185—207
<i>Daillé</i> - - - - -	208—212
<i>Beaufobre</i> - - - - -	214—229
<i>Dodwell</i> - - - - -	229—264
<i>Lardner</i> - - - - -	265—267
<i>Abauzit</i> - - - - -	268—271
<i>Tillemont</i> - - - - -	273, 274
<i>Conclusion</i> - - - - -	276—284

ERRATA.

- Page 2. line 4. dele *bad*
11. note. insert *artes* before *sollerti*. Make a stop after *percepisset*
20. line 1. for *more distant*, read *later*
72. note 1. 2. read *διδασκαλον*
77. l. 14. after *of*, read *our*
78. note. for *inbat*, read *in bac*
85. note 1. ult. instead of a period after *κοσμου*. it should be a Greek note of interrogation ;
90. l. 21. after *does not*, read *at all*
98. 19. for *spoken*, read *spoken*
104. note 1. 2. for *Ignatianus*, read *Ignatianus*
115. l. 13. read *no other* objection-
130. note 1. 8. for *affici*, read *affici*
134. l. 15. for *s'étendent*, read *s'étendent*
143. note 1. 29. after "the motives of," insert "*his conversion*"
152. note 1. 3. for *Foleti*, read *Toleti*
157. line 8. after *friends*, insert *of humankind*
163. note 1. 8. for *nor*, read *not*
167. note. for *p. 10.* read *p. 101*
188. note 1. 1. read *chap. iv*
200. l. 14. for *de* read *le*
201. note * for *scil. 15.* read *scil. 13*
210. l. 22. for *quise*, read *qui se*
223. 1. for *tous*, read *tout*
243. 24. for *potuent*, read *potuerit*
235. 15. for *animale*, read *animal*

INTRO.

1 2 3 4 5 6

INTRODUCTION.

IT has been judiciously observed, that it is not the business of the historian to profess himself a sceptic in matters of religion.

Machiavel, whose detestable principles, in his political works, are well known, found it necessary to assume a very different character, when he wrote the History of Florence. And even David Hume, in his History of England, is content with glancing at Sacred Truth by some oblique hints.

It is therefore to be wished, that Mr. Gibbon, satisfied with the applause due to him as an elegant historian, had not produced himself as an avowed champion for infidelity, in his fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, which have cast a blemish on the whole work.

It does not appear to have been essential to his history to touch at all on "*the Rise and Progress of Christianity*," much less to make so long a digression, which seems to have been wrought up with so much art, and care, and ingenuity, that we can easily trace the author's predilection for the subject. He treats it indeed *con amore*; which has induced many judicious persons to suspect, that the rest of the volume was written to introduce these two chapters with a better grace, and more decent appearance.

However, whether the conjecture be founded on truth, or not; had our author followed his
B design,

design, as "*a candid enquiry*," which he professes to do*, he would have had a better right to our approbation and esteem.

The artful insinuations of so agreeable a writer, imperceptibly seduce his readers, who, charmed with his style, and deluded with the vain pomp of words, may be apt to pay too much regard to the pernicious sentiments he means to convey. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary, that they should be reminded of the unfair proceedings of such an insidious friend†, who offers the deadly draught in a golden cup, that they may be less sensible of their danger.

The remarkable mode of quotation, which Mr. Gibbon adopts, must immediately strike every one who turns to his notes. He sometimes only mentions the author, perhaps the book, and often leaves the reader the toil of finding out, or rather guessing at the passage.

The policy, however, is not without its design and use. By endeavouring to deprive us of the means of comparing him with the authorities he cites, he flattered himself, no doubt, that he might safely have recourse to misrepresentation; that his inaccuracies might escape the piercing eye of criticism; and that he might indulge his wit and spleen, in fathering the absurdest opinions on the most venerable writers of antiquity. For, often, on examining his references, when they are to be traced, we shall find him supporting his cause by

* Ch. xv. p. 449. 2d edition.

† We may, with *Virgil*, metaphorically compare the beauties of his language, to the fragrant flowers which conceal and shelter a snake;

"Qui legitis flores, et humi nascentia fraga,
"Virgatus, o pueri! fugite hinc, later anguis in herba."

Butolic. Eclog. iii. lin. 92, 93.

manifest falsification, and perpetually assuming to himself the strange privilege of inserting in his text what the writers referred to give him no right to advance on their authority.

This breach of the common faith reposed in authors, is peculiarly indefensible, as it deceives all those who have not the leisure, the means, nor the abilities, of searching out the passages in the originals.

Our author often proposes second, or even third handed notions as new; and has gained a name among some, by retailing objections which have been long ago started, and as long since refuted and exploded.

In fact, sceptics and free-thinkers are of a date so old, and their objections were urged so early, and in such numbers, that our modern pretenders to this wisdom and philosophy can with difficulty invent any thing new, or discover, with all their malevolent penetration, a fresh flaw. The same set of men have been alone distinguished by different names and appellations, from Porphyry, Celsus, or Julian, in the first ages of Christianity; down to Voltaire, Hume, or Gibbon in the present.

Such is the plan of our author. It must be mine to obviate and oppose it. In order to which, I have selected several of the more notorious instances of his misrepresentation and error, reducing them to their respective heads, and subjoining a long list of almost incredible inaccuracies, and such striking proofs of servile plagiarism, as the world will be surprised to meet with in an author who puts in so bold a claim to originality and extensive reading.

These offensive chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History have indeed met with some excellent remarks

from a learned divine* of the university of Oxford. Nor has Cambridge neglected to send forth an able champion† in defence of our common faith‡. But as both these gentlemen have confined themselves rather to confute the principles of Mr. G. than to expose the indefensible arts of supporting them, to which he has recourse, I flatter myself, the reader of the following pages will not accuse me of engaging in a controversy already exhausted.

* Dr. Chelsum, the author of "The Remarks on Mr. Gibbon's History of the Roman Empire."

† Dr. Watson, author of "The Apology for Christianity."

‡ Oxford seems to be particularly pointed out by a sneering, sarcastical observation of Mr. Gibbon's (Note 78. c. xv.) that its "University conferred degrees on the opponents of Dr. Middleton," his favourite author. But, we should imagine, it cannot appear otherwise than a commendation, that it then expressed a just indignation against the cavils of Dr. Middleton, as it does now against those of his follower, Mr. Gibbon.

AN
EXAMINATION
OF THE
FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CHAPTERS
OF
Mr. GIBBON'S HISTORY, &c. &c.

MR. GIBBON'S own words, in the advertisement prefixed to his history, will most aptly precede the instances I mean to produce, in confirmation of the heavy charge I have brought against him. "Diligence and accuracy (says he) are the only merits which an historical writer may ascribe to himself; if any merit, indeed, can be assumed from the performance of an indispensable duty. I may, therefore, be allowed to say, that *I have carefully examined all the original materials* that could illustrate the subject which I had undertaken to treat."

Granting, then, for the present, that our author has performed what he boasts of as his merit, "That he has carefully examined all the original materials," this very circumstance will only serve

to expose him to severer animadversion. For, I trust, I shall be able to lay before my readers, ~~proofs as flagrant as they are numerous.~~ that if he had consulted the authors, whose authority he had appeals to, only with a view to misrepresent them, he could scarcely have deviated more from plain truth, and fair interpretation of their meaning, than he now does.

Mr. Gibbon having, as a prelude to his attack on Christianity, first introduced the Jews, it may be proper that I should begin by pointing out some of the very extraordinary liberties he has taken, in his account of that people. We are told by him, that *"the Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander. And as they multiplied to a surprizing degree in the east, and afterwards in the west, they soon excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations."* In this short extract are to be found many instances of inaccuracy, if not ignorance. In the first place, the Jews were never under the Assyrian yoke; for the kingdom of Judea survived that monarchy, and was ruined by the Babylonians. And when they were carried into captivity, they were by no means held in low esteem; but, on the contrary, seem to have been greatly regarded. The chief officers of the courts where they resided, were often chosen from among them. They were admitted as statesmen; made cup-bearers to the princes; and appointed governors of provinces*.

* See Daniel, c. i. ver. 3. 17.—c. ii. v. 48.—c. iii. v. 30.—c. vi. v. 1. 3.

Nehemiah, c. ii. v. 1.—Ezra, c. iv. v. 19.

See also Josephus, lib. xxi. throughout, of the Antiquities of the Jews.

It is equally unjust to speak of them as slaves to the Persians: For the first king of that country gave them permission to go home; and this, in the very first year of his reign. The permit seems to have been general; so that those who stayed behind, must have been in a state of free service: Their not accepting of the leave, plainly shews it. There is scarcely in history an instance of a conquered people being so respected; and nothing can be a greater proof of it, than their wonderful return. The Philistines, Edomites, Moabites, Hamathites, with many other ancient states in the vicinity of Judea, were about the same time subdued; and seem to have undergone a like captivity. But we do not read of any of them returning; much less of their being again constituted into a nation. And though they may not have been immediately extinct; yet their poor remains dwindled soon to nothing; while the Jews became a respectable people, and, as the author confesses, *"excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations."*

It is to be observed, that Mr. G. not only speaks of their being held in great disrepute by their conquerors; but that they were despised *for many ages*. This is strange; for their captivity was but of seventy years duration; so that upon their return, some, who had seen the former temple, were present at the dedication of the second. But the author will perhaps say, that he includes the Israelites, the ten tribes, in the account here given. But they never returned, and he must speak with great inaccuracy to call the ten tribes Jews, and to talk of their *"emerging from obscurity;"* for they were never reinstated; and we have scarcely any history concerning them.

* Ezra, ch. i. ver. 3.

But the author proceeds, and assures us, that the Jews did *emerge*: and that it was "*under the successors of Alexander.*" He does not say, that it was in the time of those kings, but *under them*. By this we might be led to suppose, that this success was not owing to their own superiority and merit, nor to the divine assistance; but to the favour and indulgence of those princes. Now it is notorious, that the Jews never found any more bitter enemies, than some of these kings. Before the time of Alexander, the Jews had begun to recover themselves, and were increasing in affluence and splendour. But, upon his death, Ptolomy, the son of Lagus, his successor in Egypt, at one sweep carried off one hundred thousand of the inhabitants of Judea; of which thirty thousand were chosen persons, whom he forced to serve in his armies. The residue he gave up for slaves to his soldiers. He demolished the walls of Jerusalem, and transplanted many of the people to Egypt, and others were obliged to settle in the regions of Barca and Cyrene*. Nothing could be more critical to a growing state, than these misfortunes. But they were not to be compared to the cruelties of Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, the tyrant of Syria. He defiled their temple, and persecuted them for their religion in a shocking manner; putting numbers of them, on that account, to death. In short, he was very *intolerant*: and the inveteracy of the Greeks in general was such, as that nothing but the divine protection could have saved the Jews from ruin; for their utter extirpation was aimed

* See Josephus, Antiq. lib. xii. c. 1 — Contra Apion, lib. 1. Eusebii Chron. — Appiani Syriaca. — Aristaeus de Iux Interp. Usher's Chronol. p. 221. — Prideaux's Connection, vol. ii.

at*. Such was the mild influence under which Mr. G. supposes the Jews to have flourished; absurdly placing to their advantage, what tended to their ruin. Let us now turn our eyes back, and reconsider the account given by our author about the Jews being in *servitude* under the *Assyrians*, and under the *Persians*: and how they languished for *many ages*; and were the *most despised portion of all their slaves*: that they were of little consequence in former times; but *emerged* from their obscurity under the successors of Alexander: when they were dispersed to the *east*, and to the *west*; and soon became the wonder of the world. What a strange assemblage is here? It is like Milton's chaos, "*without bound, without dimension: where time and place are lost.*" In short, what does this display afford us, but a deal of boyish colouring, to the prejudice of much good history.

The author will perhaps tell us, that he has the authority of Tacitus for all that he alleges. But the misfortune is, that Tacitus was very little acquainted with the ancient state of the Jews; and, setting this aside, there is nothing in the quotation, which comes up to the author's purpose. He totally mistakes the meaning of it, when he alludes to the Jewish captivity, and speaks of the people, as the most despicable of *Slaves*. I cannot find any thing of this purport in the Roman historian. He seems to have known nothing of the captivity; nor does he mention any state of slavery. There is, moreover, a mistake in Mr. G's quotation; for, according to him, the passage is—"despectissima *pars servitutis*;" (the most despised part of their

* See Diodori Siculae, lib. xi. p. 921.

Joseph. Antiq. lib. xii. p. 611.

Taciti Hist. lib. v. c. 8.

slavery)

slavery) but in the original we find it “despectiss.
“ma pars *servitutum*.”—of their foreign subjects.

This mistake, I am confident, was not designed;
and must therefore be imputed to a slip in me-
mory: but it is, however, of consequence; for the
terms *serviens* and *servire* do not necessarily denote
slavery. They may be applied to any people, who
have been conquered, and rendered tributary and
dependant*. Many nations have been reduced to
a state of subservience and even vassalage: and yet
have never been deemed slaves. The purport of
the account given by the Roman historian, is this.
He has been speaking of the chief city of the Jews,
and of their sumptuous temple, and polity: and
he supposes, that they began to make a figure soon
after the time of Alexander the Great. He men-
tions their grandeur, the rise of which he dates
from that æra; but, excepting some few vague tra-
ditions, he seems quite ignorant of every circum-
stance that has preceded. His words are as fol-
low: “† A great part of Judea is scattered in

* Dion Cassius speaking of Phraates says, *Οὗτοι δὲ Ἀραβίαι
μὴ τῶν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ μᾶλλον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασι-
λεῖας ἑσθλότητος.* Lib. xxxvii. p. 20. Edit. R. Steph. “He,
“Phraates, reigned over the Arabians, who at that time were
“subject to the Romans, as far as the Red Sea.”

The Author does not mean, by the term ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΩΝ,
“they were subject, or subservient to,” that the Arabians were
really slaves, but only that they were tributary.

† “Magna pars Judææ vicis dispersitur: habent et oppida.
“Hierosolyma gentis caput. Illic immensæ opulentæ tem-
“plum: et primis † munimentis urbs: dein regia. Templum
“intimis clausum: ad fores tantum Judæo aditus: limine præter
“sacerdotes arcebantur. Dum Assyrios penes Medosque et
“Persas oriens fuit, despectissima pars servientium. Postquam
“Macedones præpotere, rex Antiochus demere superstitionem
“& mores Græcorum dare annixus, quo minus teterrimam gen-
“tem in melius mutaret, Parthorum bello prohibitus est.”
Hist. lib. v. cap. 9.

† Would not the passage read better, if instead of *primis*, we read *firmis*?

“villages:

" villages : they have also towns or cities : Jeru-
 " salem is the metropolis. They have a temple
 " there immensely rich, and the city is strongly
 " fortified, as is also the palace. The temple
 " is shut up within; the Jews have access only
 " to the doors; none but the priests pass over the
 " threshold. Whilst the East was under the do-
 " minion of the Assyrians, and the Medes and
 " Persians, they were the most despised part of
 " their subjects. After that the Macedonians
 " gained the superiority, King Antiochus en-
 " deavouring to destroy their superstition, and to
 " infuse into them the manners of Greece, in or-
 " der to transform and amend a barbarous race,
 " was impeded in his designs by the Parthian
 " war."

In the account here given, the historian is not speaking of the Jews being carried into captivity, nor of any state of slavery; for, as I said before, he was totally unacquainted with it. He is speaking of Judea being a province to the eastern monarchs, and, he says, that the people were the meanest of all that were tributary. His reason for saying so was, because he had never heard of them antecedent to this æra; and he, therefore, makes his ignorance an argument for their obscurity.

It is to be observed, that Tacitus seems to have had as great a prejudice against the Jews, as Mr. Gibbon has; and it is therefore no wonder, that the latter so often applies to his authority. It should, however, have been considered by Mr. Gibbon, that whoever adopts another's evidence, at the same time makes himself accessory to his mistakes and absurdities. Of these, I think some traces may be found in the following quotation about the same people. Tacitus has been speaking of Antiochus being called off by the revolt of the Par-
 thians

thians under Arsaces; and then adds *, “ At that
 “ time the Macedonians being weak in power, the
 “ Parthians not yet arrived at their strength, and
 “ the Roman authority at a great distance, the
 “ Jews elected their own kings.” It is well
 known, that Tacitus was fond of refinement, and
 would fain find out the spring of action in every
 great event. Hence, instead of being conducted
 by the sage and steady historian, we are often mis-
 led by the subtilty of the politician, till we are
 quite bewildered. Thus, in the extract above,
 having mentioned that the Jewish nation grew
 great, and erected themselves into a kingdom, he
 would likewise give us the reasons for this rise and
 alteration. But he founds it all upon negative
 principles; and, instead of shewing what was the
 cause, he tells us, what was not the impediment,
 which is surely a strange way of proceeding. It
 arose, we should imagine, from their being popu-
 lous and powerful; and, at the same time, from
 the intrigues and ambition of particulars, who
 were desirous of a change in the government. No,
 says our historian; the reason of their admitting
 royalty was, because *the Macedonians were weak,*
the Parthians immature, and the Romans at a
great distance. He might have also inserted, be-
 cause they were not ruined by a famine, nor de-
 stroyed by a pestilence, nor overwhelmed by a de-
 luge. Their first king was Aristobulus (A. U. C.
 649.) between whom and their return from capti-
 vity, was an interval of above 420 years. Hence
 they might have had a king, if they had chosen it,
 before the Macedonian, or the Parthian, was at all
 known; nay, before the name of the Roman had
 well reached to the foot of Italy.

* “ Tum Judæi Macedonibus invalidis, Parthis nondum adu-
 us, & Romani procul aberant, sibi ipsi rege, imposuere.”

It is remarkable, that not one of the authors referred to by Mr. Gibbon *, in confirmation of his account of the Jews, mentions "their emerging from obscurity;" much less do they specify the particular period fixed on by our author, "under the successors of Alexander." To what has been already shewn, I shall add the words of Diodorus Siculus.

"† Under the Persian and Macedonian government, from their intermixing with the Heathen World, many of the ancient laws and institutions of the Jews were changed," as having become obsolete.

This change seems to imply a prior establishment; and that the Jews "did not emerge from obscurity" under the Persian or Macedonian empire, but had long before enjoyed the free prerogatives of their laws and liberties. The words of the historian will admit of no other construction; for, what he had before said, absolutely contradicts Mr. Gibbon's assertion.

"After speaking of the Jews coming from Egypt under the guidance of Moses, and extolling his prudence as a legislator, and for training them up to labour and martial discipline:" he continues thus, "† He (Moses) waged war also with the neighbouring nations; and having gained large tracts of land, divided it among the people for an inheritance." And

* Note z. chap. xv.

† Diodorus Siculus, lib. xl. p. 544. Wesseling. Ed. Κατὰ δὲ τὰς θύρας γυναικας ἐπιμενείας ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἐπιμενείᾳ, ἐπὶ τῶν τῶν Περσῶν ἡγεμονίας, καὶ τῶν τῶν καταλυσάτων Μανδίων, πολλὰ τῶν πατρῶν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων ἐκινήθη.

† Ἰσχυρίσθη δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀλλοφύλους τῶν Ἰδίων καὶ πολλὰ κατακτησάμενος χώραν, καταδιέδωκεν αὐτήν.

again he says, " * The Jewish nation was ever very
" populous."

It is not easy to say how this account can be made to coincide, even by the skillful Mr. G. with his representation, that " *they were the most*
" *despised portion of slaves,*" and just " *emerged*
" *from obscurity.*" How could people in such a weak and despicable condition, invade the territories of their powerful neighbours, vanquish their forces, and take possession of their country?

Our author found, that Diodorus made mention of the Jews, and one would suppose, that he therefore deemed it necessary to cite such learned authority, without regarding how widely he differed from him in the relation of the facts, and of important points in their history.

Neither does Justin, another writer appealed to by Mr. Gibbon, authorise this his assertion. He says, that " * Xerxes first subdued the Jews:
" afterwards, with the Persian nation, they were
" subjected to the Macedonian empire under
" Alexander the Great, and were for a long time
" subservient to it. On revolting from Demetrius, and seeking an alliance with the Romans,
" they were restored to their liberty, the first of
" all the eastern nations."

This can hardly be said to agree with our author's sentiments. For, if Xerxes first made them tributary, they were previously free. Nor are

† αἱ τὸ γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑπῆρχε πολυπληθεύουσα.

* Justinus, l. xxxvi. c. 2, 3. (8vo: edit. Lugd. Batav. 1650.)
" Primum Xerxes rex Persarum, Judæos domuit: postea cum
" ipsa Persis in ditionem Alexandri Magni venire, diuque in
" potestatem Macedonici imperii subiecti: Syriæ regno fuere. A
" Demetrio cum descivissent, amicitia Romanorum petita, pri-
" mum omnium ex orientalibus libertatem receperunt, facile
" tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus."

they

they described as a despicable set of slaves; on the contrary, we find them the very first whom the Romans thought worthy to receive their liberties.

After all, were we even to admit, that Mr. Gibbon had asserted nothing concerning the Jews, but what he had really found in Justin, Diodorus, and Tacitus, would he not deservedly incur our censure, for calling in the testimony of witnesses whom he himself must know to be shamefully ignorant of the facts in question?

Another part of Mr. Gibbon's account of the Jews, though given to us on the authority of Dion Cassius, is not really to be met with in that historian. Our author's words are these: "From the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius, the Jews discovered a fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome, which repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections†."

To confirm this, he relates the dreadful accounts of those at Cyrene and Cyprus‡; and appeals to Dion §.

Now, although the reference to Dion in Reimar's edition, leads us to the dismal relation of

* For instance, Justin says, that "the Jews were exiled from Egypt as contagious—that Joseph used magic arts—that it was the custom of the nation to consecrate the seventh day, called the Sabbath, by a *fast*—That, through veneration for their leader, Moses, they in all ages united the regal and sacerdotal offices in one person."

† Chap. xvi. p. 521.

‡ Chap. xvi. note 1.

§ L. lxviii. p. 1145.

"Cum magicis ibi, solerti ingenio perceperisset septimum diem more gentis in Sabbathum appellatum festis sacrauit—semperque exinde hic mos apud Judæos fuit, in omne ævum, ut eosdem reges ac sacerdotes habuerunt."

Diodorus Siculus adopts nearly the same erroneous opinions.

these

these horrid barbarities perpetrated under the reign of Trajan, which our author has circumstantially described, yet Dion gives no testimony to the preceding assertion, that "their fierce impatience of the dominion of Rome repeatedly broke out in the most furious massacres and insurrections," as these were which he had just related; *nor does he accuse them of being guilty of such*, during the long period of time which elapsed from "the reign of Nero to that of Antoninus Pius." But, on the contrary, there is no mention made by Dion of the Jews under Nero, Galba, or Otho. Under the reign of Vitellius, it is briefly said, that Vespasian "carried on a war against the Jews*." In that of Vespasian, Dion slightly speaks of Josephus†, and of the taking of Jerusalem‡?

We read no further account of them under Titus, Domitian, nor Nerva. During the reign of Trajan, the massacre at Cyrene and Cyprus are mentioned by him; and he speaks of the emperor Hadrian's being engaged in a war with them on founding the colony of Ælia Capitolina.

We see that it does not appear from Dion, but that the Jews lived in quiet submission, *without impatiently breaking forth in repeated insurrections and furious massacres*; during the reigns of several emperors between Nero and Antoninus. If their impatience of the dominion of Rome had thus broken through every restraint, and gratified its rage with the blood of their enemies, the pen of

* Dion's words are, καὶ ὁ Ὀκτωπασιανὸς Ἰουδαίους πολέμῳ. P. 1065. lib. lxx. Reimar. Ed.

† L. lxxvi. p. 1077. Reim.

‡ ὁ δὲ Τίτος, τῷ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους πολέμῳ καταχθὲς, τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶδε, καὶ τοὺς ναοὺς ἐκτελέσας. Τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις οὐχ ὅτι ἀλαδρός, ἀλλὰ καὶ νίκη καὶ σωτηρία Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ τε εἶναι ἰδόναι, ὅτι τῷ τῶν συναντηθέντων. P. 217. Steph. Ed. Xiphilin. Epitom.

the historian could not have passed it over in silence.

So that, though Mr. G. could establish the truth of this part of his history from other authority; yet, as he has appealed to Dion alone, who does not give him reason for his assertion, he merits our censure.

Our author, in treating of the Jewish œconomy and ceremonies, has, in a particular passage, not only made use of a fallible argument, but misrepresented and manifestly perverted the authority he quotes. The sentence is this,

“ If a strict obedience had been paid to the order, that every male, three times in the year, should present himself before the Lord Jehovah, it would have been impossible that the Jews could ever have spread themselves beyond the narrow limits of the promised land *.”

The authority, to which Mr. G. directs † us, as corroborating the sentiment, is that of the Universal History ‡;—where we are to find “ a sensible note † ” on the subject. Such indeed it is; but it happens, somewhat unluckily, that this sensible note supports an hypothesis directly opposite to that of Mr. Gibbon. So far is it from *denying the possibility* “ of paying a strict obedience to the order,” or insinuating a *neglect* of it; that, on the contrary, it endeavours to remove the grand objections that have been raised against it §.

But

* Page 453. c. xv.

† Note 11, c. xv.

‡ “ Universal History, vol. i. p. 603.” N. B. p. 603 is in vol. ii. fol. Lond. 1736.

§ The two grand objections are, 1st. “ If they assembled, from every part, at Jerusalem at once, how that city could contain such prodigious multitudes? and, 2^{dly}. How they could leave their cities defenceless?” In answer to the first,

But what shall we say, if, indeed, no such order was ever given? Mr. G. in asserting that there was, may perhaps be thought more excuseable, as several men of learning agree with him here. But much may be urged to prove, that they are in a mistake. The matter stands thus. It is said in Exodus, *Three times in the year shall all your men-children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel* *. The like occurs in Deuteronomy. *Three times in the year shall all the males appear before the Lord thy God: in the place which he shall choose:—and they shall not appear before the Lord empty* †. The objection made to this is to shew the absurdity of such an ordi-

the note (O) observes, that “the Talmud exempts from this obligation, 1. The women, who were to take care of their families. 2. Boys under twelve years of age. 3. All old men above sixty. 4. All the sick and impotent, lunatics, &c.”

Though by these exceptions the numbers must be greatly diminished, yet the note adds also an exception which must crush Mr. G.’s objection. “And, lastly, all that either lived at such a distance from the tabernacle, and afterwards from the temple, that they could not perform the journey on foot.” Besides this, “Calculation is here made of the capaciousness of Jerusalem; and the probability of their dwelling in tents round about it is urged.”—It is noted also, “that they did not all appear together on the same day; but took it by turns, and stayed in the city but one night; and on the next morning, having performed their devotions, returned, and made way for others.”

The latter objection is answered by shewing, that “half of the males stayed at home to guard their houses, children, wives, lands, &c. whilst the other half went up:” and furthermore, that “some went one month, and the others the next.”

Is it not strange that Mr. G. should corroborate his assertion, by appealing to an authority that contradicts it? What judgment must be formed of this proceeding? Shall we say he has not consulted the Universal History? Or that he has been guilty of gross misrepresentation, by producing this testimony to confirm his proposition, which it aims to refute?

* Chap. xxxiv. ver. 23.

† Chap. xvi. ver. 16, 17.

nance;

nance; and the impracticability of its being carried into execution. It is particularly urged, that those, who lived at a great distance, could not go up so often to Jerusalem; and if they did go up, it was still impossible for the city to hold them. Besides, they must leave their lands for too long a time neglected; and their borders would be exposed to the inroads of any enemy, that would take advantage of their absence. To obviate these objections, many well-meaning persons have considered the extent of Jerusalem, and calculated how many it could hold. They have also made an estimate of the number of tents, which might be pitched without the walls; and of other accommodations, which might be procured. They mention, that all did not come up upon the same day; and their lands, therefore, need not be supposed to have been entirely neglected. The Authors of the Universal History, as we see in the foregoing note, have recourse to the Talmud, to shew, that children, sick persons, lunatics, and old men were excused. But these expedients are as unnecessary, as the objections are idle: These learned men have been labouring to find out a remedy, where there is no disorder; for the passage is totally misunderstood. What we find in our translation rendered *thrice*, and three times; is, in the original, שלש פעמים בשנה, *tribus vicibus anni*—*at three of the changes, or seasons of the year*, every male was to present himself before the Lord. By this was not meant, that they should go up to Shiloh, or to the temple, all these three times; but only at one of the three. For three different seasons were appointed for the convenience of those who were to make their appearance. Instead of applying to the Talmud, and the Jewish rabbies, the best way to interpret the scriptures is by the scriptures; and that people went up only at one of these three times, may be seen from various passages. It is

said of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, that he went up out of his city YEARLY to worship, and to sacrifice to the Lord God of hosts in Shiloh*. And it is repeated, that the man Elkanah, and all his house, went up to offer unto the Lord the YEARLY sacrifice, and his vow†. Concerning every firstling of the flock, and of the herd, it was thus enacted:—*Thou shalt eat it before the Lord thy God, YEAR BY YEAR, in the place which the Lord shall choose‡.* We find, that once only in every year they were to make this offering. Hence it is said by the prophet Zechariah, *Every one that is left, &c. &c. shall go up from year to year to worship§.* In conformity to this we find, that the parents of our Saviour went up to Jerusalem every year: and we are told, that it was at the feast of the passover||: For this feast was more particularly observed. From these instances we may, I think, be assured, that it was once only in the year when this presentation was enjoined: at which time none were to appear before the Lord empty. At one of these seasons they brought all the offerings commanded by the law, and presented them before the Lord. *Three times in the year (or at the three particular changes and divisions of the year) shall all the males appear before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose: in the feast of unleavened bread; and in the feast of weeks; and in the feast of tabernacles; and they shall not appear before the Lord empty. Every man shall give as he is able; according to the blessing of the Lord thy God, which he hath given thee**.* Among the presents then made were the first fruits, and the firstlings of their flocks and herds. *Thou shalt do no work with the firstlings of thy bullock, nor shear the firstling of the sheep. Thou*

* Samuel, c. i. v. 3.

† C. ii. v. 21.

‡ D. ut. c. xv. v. 20.

§ Zech. c. xiv. v. 16.

|| Luke, c. ii. v. 41.

** Deut. c. xvii. v. 16, 17.

shalt eat it before the Lord YEAR BY YEAR in the place, which the Lord shall choose, thou and thy household *. But it may be said, that this is still a precept full of danger; for after all there must be a time, when one third of the people would necessarily be drafted away; and some of the provinces be bereft of their proper defence. It must likewise be inconvenient, and hardly practicable, for people at the extremities of the country to drive their cattle, and carry their other offerings to Jerusalem. And, lastly, there must have been many other impediments; such as arose from remoteness, sickness, badness of the roads, inclemency of the weather, which rendered the ordinance impolitic, as well as impracticable. These three objections are answered to our hands by the sacred writer. In respect to the injunction being injudicious, from the lands being left defenceless; it is observable that, when God appoints the yearly presentation to be made, he is pleased to promise the divine interposition and security. *For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall a y man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice (it is, in the original, at the three changes: in the seventy *תשע מאות*) of the year* †. In respect to the second objection, about conveying their cattle and other offerings, we find, in the same place where the duty is enjoined, an occasional remedy provided.—*But if the way be too long for thee, or that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee, which the Lord thy God shall choose, &c. then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine band, and shalt go up unto the place which the Lord thy God*

* Deut. c. xv. v. 19.

† Exodus, c. xxxiv. v. 24.

shalt choose *. This, I think, affords a sufficient answer to the second cavil. As to the other difficulties, which might arise from poverty, or sickness, and distance from the capital; there was also an allowance made for such cases. Many of the people resided, according to their lot, beyond Jordan; some lived near Beerseba; and others as far as Dan, and the entrance of Hamath. To many of these it must certainly have been very inconvenient, and, perhaps, impracticable, to take this annual journey. There must, likewise, among the children of Israel, as among all other nations, have been some persons in no degree of affluence. There were, undoubtedly, thousands in many of the tribes, who had their petty offerings to make, to whom, however, it would have been almost ruin to have taken such an expensive journey. All this is very true: and it was accordingly foreseen by the allwise and merciful framer of these laws. The same God who appointed the ordinance, admitted likewise of a dispensation. All reasonable excuse was allowed; and the affair seems to have been left to their own consciences. It is, therefore, farther said:—*When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he hath promised thee, &c.—if the place, which the Lord thy God hath chosen, to put his name there, be too far for thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herd, and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee: and thou shalt eat in thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after* †. That is, thou shalt eat it without offering it, or making any sacrifice; for all sacrifices, and all vows, were indispensably to be performed at Jerusalem. *Take heed that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest; but in the place, which the*

* Deut. c. xii. v. 20.

† Chap. xii. v. 21.

Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes: There thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings; and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.—Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thine oyl, or the firstlings of thy herds, or of thy flock, &c. &c. But thou must eat them before the Lord thy God, in the place, which the Lord thy God shall choose.* Then comes the dispensation above-mentioned †, that if the place were too far from them, they might remain at home; and without making any offering, enjoy the blessings bestowed upon them within their own precincts. *Thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock,—as I have commanded thee: and thou shalt eat it within thy gates.* We see here an indemnity granted to those who could not, without great inconvenience, go up; and we may suppose, that thousands in every tribe availed themselves of it.

We have not, as yet, done with our author's misrepresentations relative to the Jews. He tells us ‡, “During the long period which elapsed between the Egyptian and Babylonian servitudes, the hopes as well as fears of the Jews appear to have been confined within the narrow compass of the present life.”

In support of this he appeals to Le Clerc §.

Now it is remarkable, that so far is this author from confirming the representation given by Mr. Gibbon, that he says not a word respecting the sentiments of the Jews on this subject, at the place to which our historian refers us. He tells us || indeed that the Pharisees really believed in a resurrection, and such a one as the gospel taught, but this

* Deut. c. xii. v. 13, 14, and 17, 18.

† Ver. 21.

‡ Page 469.

§ Note 57. c. xv. P. olegom. ad Hist. Ecclesiast. c. i. § 8.

|| C. ii. § 8.

relates to a much more distant period. This being the case, what opinion can the reader have of Mr. Gibbon's fidelity in appealing to this authority?

One more instance of our author's accuracy on the subject of the Jews appears in the following passage: "After Cyrus had permitted the exile nation to return into the promised land; and after Ezra had restored the ancient records of their religion, two celebrated sects, the Pharisees and Sadduces, insensibly arose at Jerusalem."

In confirmation of the above, Josephus* is the authority appealed to. But we may again observe, that our author builds without a foundation. For Josephus, as here referred to, says nothing of the rise of the Pharisees; but only speaks of their peculiar tenets.

On reading Mr. G.'s references to the testimony of *beaten* writers, cited by him in order to oppose and contradict the Jewish and scriptural history, I could not help reflecting on an admirable passage of bishop Warburton on this subject; which the reader will thank me for introducing here, as being equally applicable to Mr. G. as to his predecessors in infidelity, and serving to shew that he only treads over again the same beaten path.

"† This is ill enough," says the bishop, "but the perversity I speak of is infinitely worse: And that is, when the same writer, on different occasions, assumes the dogmatist and sceptic on the very same question, and so abuses both characters, by the most perverse self-contradiction.

"For instance, how common is it for one of your writers, when he brings *Pagan* antiquity to

* Joseph. Antiquit. Jud. lib. xiii. c. 10.

† See the dedication prefixed to the Divine Legation of Moses, p. 39. vol. i. 8vo edit.

"contradict

“ contradict and discredit the *Jewish*, to cry up a
 “ *Greek* historian as an evidence, to which nothing
 “ can be replied? An imperfect hint from *Herodotus*, or *Diodorus*, though one lived a thousand,
 “ and the other fifteen hundred years, after the
 “ point in question, picked up from any lying va-
 “ gabond they met in their travels, shall now out-
 “ weigh the circumstantial history of *Moses*; who
 “ wrote of his own people, and lived in the times
 “ he wrote of.

“ But now turn the tables, and apply the testi-
 “ mony of those writers, and of others of the best
 “ credit of the same nation, to the confirmation of
 “ *Jewish history*, and then nothing is more uncer-
 “ tain and fallacious, than ancient writings. All
 “ antiquity is darkness and confusion: Then we
 “ hear of

———— “ *Quicquid Græcia mendax*

“ *Audet in historia.*

“ Then *Herodotus* is a lying traveller, and *Dio-*
 “ *dorus Siculus* a hasty collector.

“ Again, when the choice and separation of the
 “ *Israelites*, for God's peculiar people, is to be
 “ brought in doubt, and rendered ridiculous, then
 “ are they represented as the vilest, most pro-
 “ fligate, and perverse race of men: Then every
 “ indiscreet passage of a *declamatory divine* is raked
 “ up with care to make them odious; and even
 “ the hard fate of the great historian *Josephus*
 “ pitied, that he had *no better a subject than such*
 “ *an illiterate, barbarous, and ridiculous people**.

“ But when the scripture account of the treat-
 “ ment, which the Holy *Jesus* met with from
 “ them, is thought fit to be disputed, these *Jews*

* Discourse of Free-thinking, p. 157.

“ are

“ are become an humane and wise nation ; that
 “ interfered not with the teachings of sects, or the
 “ propagation of opinions, but where the public
 “ safety was thought to be in danger by seditious
 “ doctrines,” &c. &c.

We have seen, at some length, how little foundation Mr. G. had for appealing to the several authors, whose names figure in his notes, in support of his gross misrepresentations concerning the Jews. Let us now pass on to a review of his treatment of the first defenders of Christianity.

After attacking that revelation on which the gospel is founded, his next part was to encounter these champions of the gospel faith. The transition was easy, and natural enough.

The peculiar acrimony with which our author so frequently censures the fathers, having roused my indignation, led me to examine what reasons he had for such harsh language. And, upon examination, I found them to be either entirely groundless, or, where there was some ground for them, to be cruelly and unjustifiably exaggerated.

The views of Mr. G. are manifest ; he wishes *per fas aut nefas* to lessen the authority of the fathers, and diminish the respect and reverence justly due to them ; hoping, thereby, to aim an effectual blow at the religion, of which their testimony ever has been justly considered as a strong support. The vindication of them, therefore, is a cause in which I willingly engage ; because it will appear to be equally the cause of truth, as it is that of Christianity. Still let it be remembered, that I do not undertake an *indiscriminate* defence of *all* the fathers ; nor even of the *whole* works of any one of them. Whoever reads them must, amidst all his commendations, find something to blame.

Nor shall Mr. G. go beyond me in expressing a disapprobation of their far-fetched allegories, and of their indefensible austerities.

I shall here beg leave to introduce the following passage from Dr. Gregory Sharpe*, as expressive of my own sentiments.

“ Some men had lifted up the authority of the fathers higher than could be justified : They were not content to make saints of them, but their opinions must be decisive in all matters of faith and religious controversy.

“ From one extreme are the fathers fallen to the other, from having been almost Gods, they are become lower than the children of men. The great reverence the Christian world once had for them, may have proceeded from the excellence of their characters, and a frequent reading their productions ; for it is hard to read them, and not to be prejudiced in their favour : And that this esteem is now gone, may be owing to a neglect of their writings : And perhaps they who have been most free in their censures of them, have been least conversant in their works. Men who knew nothing more of them, than that they were Christians, strangers to their very names as well as to their real characters and writings, are most ready to pursue and join the cry against them, as if they had been the very worst, or the very weakest of men.—But for the sake of justice and honour, let us not condemn men without knowing what can be said for them ; nor for the sake of common sense, as well as common ho-

* Sharpe's "Apology for some of the first Christians," added to his "Arguments in defence of Christianity." p. 88, 89, 8vo. edit.

“ nesty,

“ nesty, condemn them without knowing what it is they have done.

“ From such voluminous writings, many strange things may and have been produced, but this is not peculiar to the Christian fathers; and if men, or books are to be judged of only by their faults, who shall be saved. It would be thought very partial, and very unjust, to glean from Diodorus, Herodotus, Livy, Pliny, Plutarch, and other good and antient pagan writers, the rubbish of all sorts that may be found in their writings, by a man who has the dirty disposition to look after such filth, and impose his medley of faults upon the world for a specimen of the veracity and approved abilities of those authors. But this has been done over and over again with the fathers; so that their latest enemies are not entitled so much as to the merit of discoverers; nor have they added much to the old heap, though they have much to clamour and abuse *.”

Tertullian, amongst the fathers, stands in a peculiar point of view. In his maturest compositions, warmth of temper betrayed him into indiscretions of sentiment and expression, perhaps not strictly defensible; and it is well known, that he at last adopted the most extravagant notions of childish

* The learned Cave has ingeniously pointed out the proper use of the Fathers.

“ Veneramur patres non tanquam fidei *judices*, sed *testes*. qui quid quovis sæculo gestum creditumvé sit nobis fideliter exponunt, sacrum fidei depositum ad nos transmittunt; quæ hereses, et quando ortæ, hunc vel illum fidei articulum oppugnârunt, perspicuè docent. Et quò vetustiores hi testes sunt, eò validius ferunt testimonium, et nos majori nitimur certitudine.” See his “*Epistola Apologetica*”—p. 18, 19.—The reader may here also find an account of the ill-treatment which the Fathers have met with, and the probable causes of it assigned,

enthusiasm.

enthusiasm. No wonder, therefore, that Mr. G. so frequently produces "the stern Tertullian"—"the zealous African," as an object of his sneering abuse. But I shall shew that the impartial historian has unfairly distorted his character.

Misrepresentations of TERTULLIAN.

I.

From the first instance I shall give, one would think Mr. G. was little acquainted with the writings of this father. For he says *, "Tertullian has written a severe treatise against idolatry, to caution his brethren against the hourly danger of incurring that guilt." "*Recogita sylvam, et quantæ latitant spinæ.*" c. 10.

These words, I should imagine, we ought to find in ch. 10. of this *his severe treatise* against idolatry. Yet our author's reference to c. 10. does not direct us to the sentence. Neither do I remember reading it in the whole treatise. When therefore he tells us, "*he has carefully examined all the original materials,*" are we to believe him? or is it his design to try how far the credulity and easy disposition of the age will suffer him to proceed unsuspected and undiscovered?

This is not the sole umbrage which the above treatise gives Mr. G. he resumes the attack in these words,

II.

"If a pagan friend (on the occasion perhaps of *sneezing*) used the familiar expression of *Jupiter*

* Note 39. c. xv.

"*blefs*

" *blest you, the Christian was obliged to protest*
 " *against the divinity of Jupiter **"

Our author here throws aside the mask, and discovers the design of his writing these two last chapters; namely, to make religion appear in the garb of ridiculous superstition†. It is to be wished, that this mode of writing were not suited to the taste of the present times. However, I have the happiness to say, that it is a *groundless sneer*.

Before I enter on the proof, I beg leave to ask Mr. G. if Tertullian gives him authority to write *idolatria* for *idololatria*. This very ridiculous blunder, were he not so learned a man, and so "*careful to examine the original materials*," one would be apt to impute to inaccuracy, or neglect of the press, if it had not uniformly preserved its place through the three editions of his history. But to proceed: We find what was allowed be-

* Note 47. c. xv.

† I may here aptly subjoin the sentiment of the learned Dr. Maclaine, on this part of Mr. Gibbon's history.

" I had been reading the account given by Mr. Edward
 " Gibbon, of the progress of the Christian religion; in which
 " the gravest subject, and one of the gravest kinds of writing,
 " are both dishonoured by a *perpetual* and unnecessary sneer. I
 " say an *unnecessary* sneer, because Mr. Gibbon lives in a country
 " where a man may write and speak as he thinks, without danger
 " or molestation. He was therefore under no necessity of aping
 " the manner of some of the French philosophers (as they are
 " pleased to call themselves), who cover their infidelity with a
 " sedate and well disguised irony, to escape the secular arm of
 " religious persecution. It is true a sneer may have its place
 " and time; but surely its *place* cannot be historical narrative,
 " through which, at least, it never ought to reign; nor is it a
 " *time* to sneer, when Christianity is the subject of discussion,
 " because this religion has a professed relation to the most solemn
 " and important interests, and has, in effect, been a source of
 " consolation and hope to the wisest of mankind in all ages."

fore

fore * to be a *caution* in this treatise on idolatry, now magnified into an *obligation*. Yet the stern Tertullian has acted the contrary part, and diminished the restraint.

For, he says, after putting them on their guard with respect to the use of their words :

“ The law forbids that the Gods of the nations should be named, not indeed that we may not utter their names, which, as I may say, conversation extorts from us. But if there must be mention made of the Gods, something should be added, by which it might appear, that I do not speak of them as Gods †.” This passage, no doubt, is what Mr. G. hints at; but it does not seem so unreasonable as to merit a sneer; especially if we consider what he had premised. “ † We should be cautious,” says he, “ lest we suffer idolatry to intermix in our discourse, either through custom, or fear.”

He excuses then the customary fault in *conversation*, (which Mr. G. seems to urge) and gives several instances of it when inoffensive; excepting one only, and even that conditionally, and proceeding from the Christian himself §. On the other hand, when this acquiescence arose from timidity, he

* Note 39. c. xv.

† C. 20. “ Deos nationum nominari lex prohibet: non utique ne nomina eorum pronuntiemus, quæ nobis ut dicamus conversatio extorquet. Quod si Deos dicendum erit, adjiciendum est aliquid, quo adpareat, quia non ego illos Deos dico.”

‡ “ Sed enim cum conversatio divinæ disciplinæ non factis tantum verum etiam verbis periclitetur—meminisse debemus esse in verbis quoque idololatriæ incursum præcavendum, aut de consuetudinis vitio, aut timiditatis.”

§ “ Ceterum consuetudinis *viciam* est me Hercule dicere, me diis fidius, *accedente ignorantia* quorundam qui ignorant jurandum esse per Herculem.”

ranks

ranks it as inexcusable, and explains when it might be said to proceed from this cause *.

“† A Christian likewise,” says he, “will not suffer himself to be *blessed* by the Gods of the heathen; for this is to be cursed by God. If I should *give alms* to any one, or do him some other good action, and he should intreat his Gods to be propitious to me: in that case, my gift or action redounds to the honour of the idols, through whom he recompences my favour with a blessing.”——

We now see that we have not, through the whole quotation, the particular instance of *sneezing* which Mr. G. is pleased to give as a matter to be laughed at; and I hope the wide difference between the words of Tertullian, and those of our author, will not pass unnoticed by the ingenuous reader. The one speaks with a seriousness and benevolence highly becoming a sincere Christian; the other, with that air of ridicule and detraction, in which the Sceptic usually treats such matters. But, as our author has not sufficient reason for his sarcastical remark, shall he with impunity be suffered to make it? Nay, even pitiful as it is, he cannot call it his own. I trust I shall be able to direct my reader, before I conclude, to a modern writer

* “*Timiditatis est autem, cum te alius per deos suos obligat juratione, vel aliqua testificatione, et tu, ne intelligaris, quiescis: nam æque quiescendo confirmas majestatem eorum, cujus causa videberis obligatus. Quid refert Deos nationum dicendo Deos, an audiendo, confirmes? jures per idola, an ab alio adjuratus, adquiescas?*”

† C. 22. “*Æque benedici per Deos nationum, Christo initiatus non sustinebit, ut semper rejiciat immundam benedictionem, et eam sibi in Deum convertens emundet. Benedicti per Deos nationum, maledicti est per Deum. Si cui dederis elemosynam, vel aliquid præstiteris beneficii, oblatio mea vel operatio idolorum honor erit, per quæ benedictionis gratiam compensat.*”

from

from whom he has borrowed this and many other abusive sneers.

III.

As a third instance, I shall here shew how Mr. G. mutilates and mistranslates a passage, which he produces, to bring in this father guilty of passing an unjust sentence of "condemnation on the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans."

I have translated the material part inserted in our author's history, as literally as the different idioms of the two languages, and the author's mode of writing will permit †. The whole passage in the original is transcribed in the note, that the learned may see what foundation I have for my charge.

† TERTULLIAN—*On Public Shows.*

G. 30. "But what a spectacle is now at hand, the Advent of the Lord, now undoubted, now glorious, now triumphant? What exultation of angels, what glory

Mr. GIBBON'S translation. (p. 474.)

"You are fond of spectacles," exclaims the stern Tertullian, "expect the greatest

* Note 70. c. xv. Tertullian de spectaculis, c. 30.

† The words which our author has omitted in his translation are marked out by a different character. I have placed my translation in a column opposite to Mr. Gibbon's, that his partiality and unfairness may be more manifest.

‡ Tertullianus de spectaculis, c. xxx. edit. Rigalt.

"Quale autem spectaculum in proximo est, adventus Domini, jam indubitati, jam superbi, jam triumphantis? quæ illa exultatio angelorum, quæ gloria resurgentium sanctorum? quale regnum exinde iustorum? qualis civitas nova Hierusalem? At enim supersunt alia spectacula, ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies, illæ nationibus insperatas, illæ derisus, cum tanta sæculi vetustas, et tot ejus natiuitates uno igne baurientur. Quæ tunc spectacula latitudo? quid admirer? quid rideam? ubi gaudeam?

" glory of the saints rising: " greatest of all spec-
 " again, thenceforth what a " tacles, the last and
 " kingdom of the just? what " eternal judgment
 " a city the new Jerusalem? " of the universe.
 " Yet there remain other spec- " How shall I ad-
 " tacles, the last and eternal " mire, how laugh,
 " day of judgment, that day " how rejoice, how
 " unvisited for by the nations, " exult, when I be-
 " that day derided by them, " hold so many
 " when all the succession of " proud monarchs,
 " ages shall be swallowed up in " and fancied gods,
 " one conflagration. What a " groaning in the
 " prodigious spectacle will " lowest abyss of
 " this be? How may I ad- " darkness; so many
 " mire? " magi-

" gaudeam? ubi exultem? tot spectans ac tantos reges, qui in
 " caelum recepti nuntiabantur, cum ipso Jove ac ipsis suis testibus
 " in imis tenebris congemiscantes? item principes persecutores
 " Domitii nomine, sceleribus quam ipsi contra Christianos savi-
 " erunt flammis insulantibus liquecentes; praeterea sapientes illos
 " philosophos coram discipulis suis una conflagrantibus, quibus
 " nihil ad Deum pertinere suadebant, quibus animas aut nullas,
 " aut non in pristina corpora redituras adfirmabant; etiam poe-
 " tas non ad Rhadamanti, nec ad Minos, sed ad imaginati
 " Christi tribunal palpitantes. Tunc magis tragœdi audiendi,
 " magis scilicet vocales in sua propria calamitate. Tunc histri-
 " ones cognoscendi solutiores multo per ignem. Tunc spec-
 " tandus ausiga, in flammæ rota totus ruber: Tunc xyllact con-
 " templandi, non in gymnasiis, sed in igne jaculati. Nisi quod
 " nec tunc quidem velim visos, ut qui malim ad eos potius con-
 " spectum insatiabilem conferre, qui in Dominum desavierunt.
 " Hic est ille (dicam) fabri aut quæstuarii filius, sabbati destructor,
 " Samarites, et dæmonium habens. Hic est quem à Juda rede-
 " mistis, hic est ille arundine et colaphis diverberatus, sputamen-
 " tis dedecoratus, felle et aceto potatus. Hic est quem clam
 " discentes subriperunt, ut resurrexisse dicatur, vel hortolanus
 " detraxit, ne lactucæ suæ frequentia commeanum adlæderen-
 " tur. Ut talia spectes, ut talibus exultes, quis tibi prætor, aut
 " consul, aut quæstor, aut sacerdos de sua liberalitate præstabit?
 " et tamen hæc jam quodammodo habemus per fidem spiritu
 " imaginante representata. Ceterum qualia illa sunt, quæ nec
 " oculus vidit, nec auris audiit, nec in cor hominum ascenderunt?
 " Credo, circo et utraque cavea, et omni stadio gratiora."

"mire? how may I laugh?
 "how may I rejoice? how
 "may I exult? when I be-
 "hold so many and so great
 "kings, who were reported to
 "have been received up to hea-
 "ven, groaning in infernal
 "darkness, together with Ju-
 "dith and his adherents?
 "likewise governors, perse-
 "cutors of the name of the
 "Lord, dissolving in insult-
 "ing flames, more fierce than
 "they themselves raged
 "against the Christians;
 "moreover, those wise phi-
 "losophers, blushing before
 "their disciples, burning to-
 "gether with them, whom
 "they persuaded that God had
 "no concern with the affairs of
 "the world, whom they assur-
 "ed, either that men were not
 "endued with souls, or that
 "they did not return into their
 "former bodies; poets also
 "trembling, not before Rha-
 "damantus, nor before Mi-
 "nos, but at the unthought-
 "of tribunal of Christ.—
 "Then the tragedians will
 "be more audible, more
 "loudly lamentable in their
 "own calamity," &c.

"magistrates, who
 "persecuted the
 "name of the Lord,
 "liquefying in fier-
 "er fires than they
 "ever kindled a-
 "gainst the Chris-
 "tians; so many
 "sage philosophers
 "blushing in red hot
 "flames, with their
 "deluded scholars;
 "so many celebrated
 "poets trembling
 "before the tribu-
 "nal, not of Minos,
 "but of Christ; so
 "many tragedians
 "more tuneful in
 "the expression of
 "their own suffer-
 "ings; so many
 "dancers"—

Such is the passage here appealed to, in Tertul-
 lian. I mean not to argue on the propriety, or to
 enter

enter into a vindication of it. My point is to expose the shameful mutilation which Mr. G. has been here guilty of. Who can observe with indifference, how he culls every sentence, that is adapted to his purpose of vilifying the Father; nay, often takes a part of one, and leaves out the remainder? He selects each furious expression of "the zealous African," but passes over the reasons assigned by him. To induce us the more readily to condemn the zealot, and to *enliven* the picture not coloured enough already, he inserts the words "red hot flames;" and lest the sufferers should be deemed only *few in number*, he makes the frequent addition of *so many* magistrates,—*so many* poets, &c. though no such expressions occur in the original. Thus he continually exaggerates the relation, too dismal and horrid without such aggravation. I cannot, therefore, but think, that, if it is "an *infernal* description," which in an equivocal sense of the word we may allow, our author has rendered it still more so by his unfair and partial translation.—Besides, after he has quoted *the most offensive sentences*, he affectedly asks "leave of the humanity of the reader to draw a veil over the rest of this infernal description, which, he says, the zealous African pursues in a long variety of affected and unfeeling witticisms*."

I should be glad to know where our historian finds this "long *variety* of affected and unfeeling witticisms." In Tertullian, after a sentence or two, speaking of the stage-players and wrestlers of the Roman games, as being in the same deplorable situation, we have words of a different import, expressive of the indignities and reproaches cast on our Saviour by the Jews; which he retorts on the

deluded nation, at that time, to be convinced of their error. And concludes with a very rational observation: How unprofitable and trifling such amusements are, in comparison of that ineffable bliss, "which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive."

But I beg leave *particularly* to ask the reason why Mr. G. appeals to this passage of Tertullian as a proof of his asserting the "condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans?" Tertullian only instances false gods, deified monarchs, inhuman magistrates, profligate actors, and atheistical philosophers; and unless these come under the denomination "of the wisest and most virtuous of the Pagans," our author must be charged with gross misrepresentation.

IV.

We come now to the fourth instance of the liberty our author takes with Tertullian. Having spoken in high terms of the virtues of the Primitive Christians, he proceeds thus*: "Near a century afterwards, Tertullian, with an honest pride, could boast, that *very few* Christians had suffered by the hands of the executioner, except on account of their religion." This glorious commendation Mr. G. disgraces by the following note. "He adds, however, with some degree of hesitation, *aut si † aliud jam non Christianus ‡.*"

I first observe that Tertullian says not only *very few*, but, more emphatically, *none* §: "No Chris-

* Page 481.

† Note 83. c. xv, Tertullian. Apolog. c. 44.

‡ In Rigalt's edition we read, *Aut si et aliud, &c.*

§ *Nemo illic Christianus, &c.*

"than is in that number," &c. That Tertullian expresses any degree of "hesitation," I cannot perceive*. However that be, it is certain that the primitive Christians did not look on any one as a true member of their society who scandalized his profession by his immoral practices†. If this be so, our author has undoubtedly shewn his *kind* intention, even at the hazard of inconsistency, to tarnish the encomium he himself has given the professors of Christianity, even without a sneer, in these words: "But the primitive Christian demonstrated his faith by his virtues; and it was very justly supposed, that the divine persuasion which enlightened or subdued the understanding, must, at the same time, purify the heart, and direct the actions of the believer ‡, &c."

V.

Our historian says §, that "among the various articles (of luxury) which excited the pious indignation (of the primitive Christians) was the practice of shaving the beard, which, according to the expression of Tertullian, is a lie against our own faces, and an impious attempt

* There is a note in Rigalt's edition at this place, which will quite clear Tertullian from any suspicion of hesitation. His words are (Apolog, p. 34. not. l.) "Est enim *μακαριστες*, ut ait Arrianus Episteti interpretes, *λογον μὴ τοιούτοις ἔργῳ ἀλλότῃ*. Appellatione Judæi Christianum intelligit." L. ii. c. 9.

† This remark is particularly confirmed by a canon which we read in Dupin, (Life of St. Basil, tom. ii. p. 530.)

"Dans le canon quarante-cinquième, il remarque que le nom de Chrétien ne servira de rien à celui qui mène une vie indigne d'un Chrétien." "The name of Christian will be of no service to him who leads a life unworthy of a Christian."

‡ Page 479.

§ P. 483, 484.

"to improve the works of the Creator?"—In opposition to this, I would observe, that the expression of Tertullian cannot well be translated, *Non sic agamus contra nostra facies*: "He says, indeed, "Will he please God, who alters his countenance with a razor? *inutilem se facit*," &c. This, I suppose, is the passage which Mr. G. hints at: We find nothing at all in Tertullian of the other part of his sentence, "an impious attempt to improve the works of the Creator." The Fathers may sometimes have carried their attention to minute ceremonies too far, and been too fond of frivolous austerities; yet surely this can give no foundation for heightening their excesses, or aggravating their foibles. I shall have occasion to shew, in the prosecution of my work, that Mr. G. has servilely adopted the sarcasm from a modern writer.

VI.

Mr. G. says, "† Yes, notwithstanding the many favourable occasions which might invite the Roman missionaries to visit their Latin provinces, it was late before they passed either the sea, or the Alps; nor can we discover, in those great countries, any assured traces, either of faith or of persecution, that ascend higher than the reign of the Antonines."

At note 170, he adds, "With regard to Africa, see Tertullian ad Scapulam, c. 3."

Now Tertullian, in c. 3, treats of a different subject; and in c. 4, so far is he from speaking of Christianity as being slow, that he particularly dwells on the rapid increase, and the vast number

* Note 88, c. xv. Tertullian de spectaculis, c. 23.

† "An Deo placebit qui vultus suos novacula mutat? *in fidelis erga faciem suam*," &c.

† Page 510.

of converts to the faith. Even our author has, hereafter*, cited the passage with this view: "What will you do," says Tertullian†, "with so many thousands of men and women of all ages, of every dignity, voluntarily delivering themselves up to you? How many and how great fires, what numbers of swords will you have occasion for?" &c. I do not know how Mr. G. can impartially refer to Tertullian for a proof of his assertion. For, by his mentioning so emphatically the immense number of those who had embraced the Christian religion, it inevitably follows that it could not be recently founded, or only propagated at the late period our historian pitches upon. It must not be denied, however, that some of the authors cited by him countenance his opinion; yet it is surprising he should crowd in among them Tertullian, whose authority would have been more aptly appealed to, where he speaks of "the eagerness with which the gospel was received on the burning sands of Africa."

VII.

Our historian wilfully disguises *Marcion*, a chief heretic‡, "under the name of a stranger from Pontus, who proposed to fix his residence in the

* Note 187. c. xv.

† Tertullian ad Scapulam, c. iv.

" Quid facies de tantis millibus hominum, tot viris ac seminis, omnis sexus, omnis ætatis, omnis dignitatis offerentibus se tibi? Quantis ignibus, quantis gladiis opus erit? Quid ipsa Carthago passura est decimanda à te, cum propinquos, cum contubernales suos illic unusquisque cognoverit, cum viderit illic fortasse et tui ordinis viros ac matronas, et principales qualque personas, et amicorum tuorum vel propinquos vel amicos? Parce ergo tibi, si non nobis, parce Carthagini, si non tibi; parce provinciæ visa intentione tua obnoxia facta est contusionibus et militum et inimicorum suorum cujusque."

‡ Page 496.

" capital;

“ capital; from whom the Roman Church received, in a single donation, the sum of two hundred thousand sesterces.”

He refers us to Tertullian*, who speaks of this person in a very different manner, and informs us, that, after this donation, he set forth heretical opinions; on which, the church returned him his money, and expelled him from her society.

Mr. G.'s design in thus concealing Marcion's name, and representing his case in a different manner from what Tertullian, whom he cites, has done, appears to be, that he might the more easily describe the church, as being in an opulent luxurious state †, eager to extort the possessions of its members; and also that he might more covertly pass over the material circumstance mentioned by the Father, that the great sum was in a disinterested manner returned to him again.

VIII.

Our author says ‡, “ the pagan magistrates sometimes proceeded with more temper and moderation than is usually consistent with religious

* Note 134. Tertullian de præscriptione, c. 30.

“ Marcion quidem cum ducentis sesterdis quæ ecclesie intulerat, novissime in perpetuum discidium relegati, vena doctrinarum suarum disseminaverunt.”

† Father Paul, of ecclesiastical benefices and revenues, speaks of this matter in a more accurate and ingenuous manner (English translation, 8vo edit.):

P. 7. “ A remarkable instance of these large contributions, was that of Marcion, about the year 170, who made an offering of 500 drachmas of gold at one time, in the church of Rome. But because he held certain unsound doctrines in matters of faith, she expelled him out of her congregations, and returned him all his money, believing she would have been polluted, in keeping the money of an heretic.”

‡ Page 529.

“ zeal.”

"zeal." This he instances by the example of Pliny; and would corroborate his observation by informing us, that "Tertullian expatiates on the fair and honourable testimony of Pliny, with much reason and some declamation*."

The chapter referred to, speaks of Pliny, and the emperor his master, in a language very different from applause. Tertullian says, "that the Christians were not allowed the common privilege even of all other criminals, that of speaking in their own behalf;" and continues thus with respect to Pliny himself,—"+ Pliny the younger, being governor of the province, condemned some of the Christians, and degraded others; and being alarmed at the great number of them, consulted the emperor Trajan what he should do with the rest."

Tertullian does not appear in this passage "to expatiate on the fair and honourable testimony of Pliny" in a strain of declamatory approbation, as we should imagine he did from the words of Mr. G. For the governor proceeded to judgment against the Christians, before he had consulted the emperor. Tertullian, therefore, could not well pass any encomium on such severe conduct as this towards the Christians. Was there indeed the least doubt about his sentiment, the continued strain of just censure, with which he lashes "the moderate Trajan's answer," must immediately determine it †.—If we may judge from the words of

* C. xvi. note 23. Apolog. c. 2.

† "Plinius enim secundus, cum provinciam repperet, dominis quibusdam Christianis, quibusdam gradu pulsus, ipsa tamen multitudine perturbatus, quid de cetero ageret, consulit tunc Trajanum imperatorem" Apolog. c. 2.

‡ "Tunc Trajanus rescripsit, hoc genus inquirendos quidem non esse, oblatos vero puniri oportere. O sententiam necessitate

of this father, our author has not, without good reason, inserted the limited particle *sometimes*, when he says, "the pagan magistrates *sometimes* proceeded with more temper and moderation than is usually consistent with religious zeal." Nor does he give us reason to credit "the temperate policy of the Roman legislators, and the humane lenity of the emperor and his prefect," on whom our historian seems to think he cannot sufficiently lavish his compliments, though he thereby shows himself to be as insensible as the Romans to the unjust sufferings of the Christians†.

"state confusam! negat inquirendos, ut innocentes, et mandant puniendos, ut nocentes. parcit et sevit, dissimulat, et animadvertit. Quid temetipsum censura circumvenis? Si damnas, cur non laqueis? Si hos inquis, cur non et alios? vis? solum Christianum inquis non licet, offerri licet," &c.

• P. 541, &c.

† There is another reflection made by Mr. G. on Tertullian, which, as it cannot be called a misrepresentation, I shall place in a note.

Our author says, note 194. c. xv, "When Tertullian assures the pagans, that the mention of the prodigy" (of the darkness at the passion of our Saviour) "is found in *Arcanis* (not *Archivis* *via vestra*) (see his Apology, c. 21.) he probably alludes to the Sibylline verses, which relate it exactly in the words of the gospel."

In answer to this, it may be said, that the word *Arcanis* may imply *Archivis*; they have at least been considered as synonymous terms by judicious writers. Rigalt, in his edition of Tertullian, writes it, *Archivis* in the note on this passage, though it is *Arcanis* in the text. The learned Beza also, in quoting part of this chapter, transcribes the word *Archivis*, "quem Romani in suis *Archivis* habeant," Tertullian, Apol. c. 21. (Beza Comment. in Marc. xv. 33.) Besides, there is not the most distant intimation of Tertullian's alluding to the Sibylline verses, which the penetrating, though prejudiced, eye of our historian vaunts to have discovered.

Having

Having convicted Mr. Gibbon of so many unfair quotations from Tertullian, I proceed now to give a very striking instance of his

Misrepresentation of SULPICIUS SEVERUS.

Our author says *, " In the council of Laodicea (about the year 360) the Apocalypse was tacitly excluded from the sacred canon, by the same churches of Asia, to which it was addressed; and we may learn, from the COMPLAINT of Sulpicius Severus, that their sentence had been RATIFIED by THE GREATER NUMBER of Christians of his time."

It happens rather unluckily for the credit of our historian, that *Sulpicius makes no complaint*; nor do we meet, in that author, with any *ratification of such a sentence*. I have great reason to assert, that I have had the satisfaction of discovering the passage to which Mr. G. does not choose to refer his reader; at least, I have the sentiment of Sulpicius on the subject: It is thus introduced: "† Some time afterwards Domitian, the son of Vespasian, persecuted the Christians. At which time, he banished John the apostle and evangelist into the island Patmos; where he wrote and published the book of the sacred *Apocalypse*, (*which indeed is not received by some, either through folly or impiety,*) the secret mysteries being revealed to him." The sense and connection point out this as the pas-

* Note 65. c. xv.

† Sulpicius Severus, l. ii. c. xlv. p. 399. 8vo edit. Hornius, "Interfecto deinde tempore, Domitianus, Vespasiani filius, persecutus est Christianos. Quo tempore, Joannem apostolum atque evangelistam in Pathmum insulam relegavit: ubi arcanis tibi mysteriis revelatis, librum sacre Apocalypsis (*qui quidem à PLERISQUE aut stulto aut impio non recipitur*) conscriptum edidit."

sage to which Mr. G. alludes. At least we must suppose this, till he can produce some other passage from this author, on which he might found his remark. *The complaint*, as it is styled, of Sulpicius Severus, is so important as to be penned up in a short parenthesis. And though we might expect, from the representation of Mr. G. to find in this author the formal account of "the tacit exclusion of the Apocalypse *," and the reasons displayed at length, which induced the Christians of his time to ratify the sentence of the council of Laodicea. Yet no reader, the most versed in Sulpicius, can discover any thing like this in his history. As to our author's saying, that "their sentence was ratified by the greater number of Christians of the time of Severus," the original word *plerique*, which is translated by him "*the greater number*," cannot have this import here. Because it is impos-

* The author of the Remarks (p. 17, &c.) has given reasons for the conduct of the council of Laodicea; and shewed, that the tacit exclusion of the Apocalypse consisted, not in its being proscribed, but, in that it was not enjoined to be read.

The learned Dailleus (or Daille) is of the same sentiment; that "it was not read in the church, because it was not found in the number of those books which the council decreed should be read."

"Cum postremus concilii Laodicensis canon, qui est 163
"codicis Græci ecclesiæ universæ, in ecclesia libros alios legi
"præterquam canonicos prohibeat, eosdem omnes ordine re-
"cepset. Inseruit quidem in codice suo Dionysius exiguum prin-
"cipium canonis quo prohibetur ne, præter Veteris & Novi
"Testamenti volumina, ulli alii libri legantur; sed eorundem
"librorum catalogum prorsus omisit, veritus reor, ne eccle-
"siam Romanam offenderet, in qua multis ante annis Innocen-
"tius pontifex in Veteris Testamenti canonem retulerat Mac-
"cabæos, Sapientiam, Ecclesiasticum, Tobiam, Judith, quo-
"rum apud patres Laodiceos nulla est mentio, cum viginti
"duorum tantum Veteris Testamenti librorum meminerint, &
"de Novo de Apocalypsi tacuerint. Si cui refectiois istius pro-
"babiliior occurrat ratio, per me eam edat licet: mihi quidem
"ea visu est verisimillima." *De vero usu Patrum*, p. 72.

ble to represent Sulpicius Severus as ~~having the~~
~~the greater number of Christians with folly and impi-~~
~~ty.~~ To make sense of the passage, it is necessary
 to suppose that he only meant *some*, or *several**, of
 the Christians were guilty of this folly and impiety.

Such then being the very material difference be-
 tween the words used by Sulpicius Severus, and
 those assigned to him by Mr. Gibbon, can we
 avoid bringing him in guilty, either of "not con-
 sulting the original," or of wilfully perverting
 it? The misrepresentation, if it had passed unde-
 tected, would have furnished a notable argument
 against the canonical authority of the Apocalypse.
 I shall here subjoin, for the sake of connection,
 another instance of misrepresentation which our
 author has been guilty of in speaking of that book.
 After his groundless remark of the complaint of
 Sulpicius Severus, which I have just now exposed,
 he thus pursues his note †.

"From what causes then is the Apocalypse at
 "present so generally received by the Greek, the
 "Roman, and the Protestant churches? The fol-
 "lowing ones may be assigned, 1. The Greeks
 "were subdued by the authority of an impostor,
 "who, in the sixth century, assumed the character
 "of Dionysius the Areopagite. 2. A just appre-
 "hension, that the grammarians might become
 "more important than the theologians, engaged
 "the council of Trent to fix the seal of their infal-
 "libility on all the books of scripture, contained
 "in the Latin vulgate, in the number of which
 "the Apocalypse was fortunately included. (Fra

* If we only look into Stephens's Thesaurus, we shall find
 (vol. ii. p. 649.) on the authority of Quintillian, that *plerique*
 does not always imply a *majority*, but signifies *nonnulli*, *some*.

† Note 65. c. xv.

"Paolo

“ Paolo Istoria del Concilio Tridentino, l. ii.) 3.
 “ The advantage of turning those mysterious prophecies against the see of Rome, inspired the protestants with uncommon veneration for so useful an ally. See the ingenious and elegant discourses of the present bishop of Litchfield on that unpromising subject.”

For the first of these remarks, Mr. G. quotes no authority; I shall therefore pass on to what he observes on the determinations of the council of Trent. His partiality will appear in purposely omitting the important consideration which induced the council “ to fix the seal of their infallibility upon the Apocalypse.”

That very ridiculous reason, which our historian has singled out, is indeed mentioned by Father Paul; but, at the same time, the Father gives another more substantial reason on which the council built their determination. In short, it * appears “ that they looked on the Apocalypse as having equal authority with the epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews; that of St. James; the second of St. Peter; the second and third of St. John; and the epistle of St. Jude: Of the authenticity of which, though there had been doubt in former times, yet by use and custom, they had obtained canonical authority.”

* Historia del Concilio Tridentino Di Pietro Soave Polano, fol. edit. Lond. 1619.

L. ii. p. 148, “ Altri erano di parere, che tre ordini fossero stabiliti: Il primo di quelli, che sempre furono tenuti per divini; il 2° di quelli, che altre volte hanno ricevuto dubbio, ma per uso ottenute autorità canonica; nel qual numero sono le 6 epistole (cio è sotto nome di S. Paolo a gli Hebrei, di S. Giacomo, 2ª di S. Pietro, 2ª & 3ª di S. Giovanni, & una di S. Jude) & l'Apocalisse del Nuovo Testamento, & alcune particole degli evangelisti. Il 3° di quelli, che mai sono certificati, &c.”

We have here an evident proof that Mr. G. is equally expert in misrepresenting a modern as an ancient writer, in that he wilfully conceals the most material reason, with a design, no doubt, to instil into his reader a notion that the authenticity of the Apocalypse is built on the slightest foundation.

As to "*the uncommon veneration* with which the " Protestants are inspired for the Apocalypse," because it " gives them the advantage of turning " some mysterious prophecies against the see of " Rome;" I shall only observe, that if the Protestants have just grounds for doing so, if our Mede and our Newton have, in a manner, demonstrated, however mysterious these prophecies may be thought at first sight, that, when applied to the history of the church, they become clear, and point out, in the most expressive manner, the rise and progress of the Romish corruptions; then, surely, whatever Mr. G. and such determined opposers of Christianity may think, Protestants have the justest grounds for receiving the Apocalypse, as the work of an inspired author, and for treating it with *uncommon veneration*.

Misrepresentation of CLEMENS.

Our author says, " * The epistle of Clemens " does not lead us to discover any traces of episcopacy either at Corinth or Rome."

I do not know what "*traces*" Mr. G. deems requisite " to lead us to discover episcopacy;" but the words of Clemens, in his epistle to the Corinthians, do really give evident proofs of it. For, otherwise, if that sacred order was not known in the church, it is perfectly surprising that Cle-

* Note 108. c. xv.

mens should say of "the apostles, that they ordained the first fruits of their labours to be *bishops*; and gave them the charge of the rising church." And furthermore, that "they should lay down the necessary qualifications for a bishop, in order to keep a constant and proper succession; foreseeing what contention there would be in succeeding ages respecting the name and office of a bishop."—Yet these Clemens relates; nay Clemens, himself was styled bishop of Rome.

And are not these sufficient traces of episcopacy? Can such passages as these be adduced from an epistle, whose author is to be considered as ignorant of such a distinction, or of such an order of men in the church? But I leave the determination to the judgment of the reader.

* *Clementis Episcopi Romani Epistola ad Corinthios, I. SS. Patrum Apostol. opera, tom. i. 8vo. edit. Russel.*

§ 42. p. 158. Οἱ ἀποστολὸι—κατὰ χάριν οὐ καὶ πόλει κηρύσσοντες; καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἔΠΗΚΟΠΟΥΣ καὶ διακόνους τῶν μαθητῶν ἀνίστανται. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καί ποτε.

§ 44. Καὶ οἱ ἀποστολὸι ἡμῶν ἐγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔΡΙΣ ἔΣΤΑΙ ἘΠὶ ΤΟΥ ὌΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΗΣ ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΗΣ. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν πρόνοιαν εὐλητότερος τελεία, κατίσθησαν τοὺς προσηλυτισμένους; καὶ μετὰ ἐπινοίας διδασκῶν, ὅπως ἰσὺν καμψίαν, διαδίδονται ἱεροῖ δοκιμασίῃσι ἄνδρες ἐν λειτουργίᾳ αὐτῶν. Τὸν οὖν κατασταδόντα ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου, ἢ μετὰ ὑφ' ἑτέρου ἰλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνδοκασάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμίμητος τῇ ποιμαίνῃ τῷ Χριστῷ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡνυχὸς καὶ ἀβασάνου, μεμαρτυρημένους τῇ πολλῇ χρόνῳ ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους ἐν δικαίᾳ νομίζομεν ἀποβαλίσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. κ. τ. λ.

* See the notes in Russel.

Misrepresentation of IRENÆUS.

“ The knowledge of foreign languages,” says our author, “ was frequently communicated to the contemporaries of Irenæus, though Irenæus himself was left to struggle with the difficulties of a barbarous dialect, whilst he preached the gospel to the natives of Gaul.”

In support of this, he appeals to * Irenæus.

Let us see what Irenæus really says. “ † You will not expect from me, who live among the Celtæ, and am called upon to make use of a barbarous language, the art of speech which I have not learned; nor the elegant power of a writer, which I have not affected; nor the harmonious diction, which I am ignorant of: But my writing is simple, true, and plain.”

May we not here appeal to every candid reader, whether there is the least foundation for Mr. G.’s assertion? Irenæus does not say he was ignorant of the Celtic language, or that “ he was left to struggle with the difficulties of a barbarous dialect;” on the contrary, he plainly says, “ he was called upon to make use of it.” It is beyond all doubt, therefore, that our author adopt-

* Note 74. c. xv. 3d edit. Irenæus adv. Hæres. Proem. P. 3.

† Irenæus adversus Hæres. Erasmi, fol. edit. 1532.

P. 2. “ Non autem exquires à nobis, qui apud Celtas commoramus, et in barbarum sermonem plerumque avocamur, orationis artem quam non didicimus, neque vim conscriptoris, quam non affectavimus, neque ornamentum verborum, neque suadelam quam nescimus: sed simpliciter et vere et idiotice, ea quæ tibi cum dilectione scripta sunt, cum dilectione percipies, et ipse augeas ea penes te, ut magis idoneus quam nos, quasi semen et inivra accipiens à nobis: et in latitudine sensus tui multum fructificabis ea, quæ in paucis à nobis dicta sunt, et potenter assures his qui tecum sunt, ea quæ invalide à nobis relata sunt.”

ed the remark ready made to his hands by Middleton, who, as will afterwards be taken notice of, thus wrested the passage to serve his own purpose. But such gross blunders are the necessary consequences of blindly transcribing quotations, without ever examining their accuracy, by looking into the authors quoted.

Misrepresentations of CYPRIAN:

I.

Our author, after disparaging the characters and conduct of the first bishops in general, singles out the prelate Cyprian, as the particular object of his censure; which he thus expresses:

“ * From the imperious declamations of Cyprian, we should naturally conclude, that the doctrines of excommunication and penance formed the most essential part of religion; and that it was less dangerous for the disciples of Christ to neglect the observance of the moral duties; than to despise the censures and authority of their bishops. Sometimes we might imagine that we were listening to the voice of Moses; when he commanded the earth to open, and to swallow up, *in consuming flames*†, the rebellious race which refused obedience to the priesthood of Aaron; and we should sometimes suppose, that we heard a Roman consul asserting

* Page 301, 302:

† Mr. G. has introduced, in this laboured, yet distorted, description, as in the case of Tertullian, the expressive words, *consuming flames*; to compleat the catastrophe, notwithstanding he is not warranted to insert them by the original relation of Moses. His manner of working up the whole of this sentence, plainly intimates that he took this opportunity of reflecting on the conduct of Moses.

“ the majesty of the republic, and declaring his
 “ inflexible resolution to enforce the rigour of the
 “ laws. If such irregularities are suffered with
 “ impunity,” (it is thus that the bishop of Car-
 “ thage chides the lenity of his colleague) “ if such
 “ irregularities are suffered, there is an end of
 “ EPISCOPAL VIGOUR, an end of the sublime and
 “ divine power of governing the church, an end
 “ of Christianity itself.”

With what bitterness of language, and vehement severity, does Mr. G. here inveigh against Cyprian*. How studied is his translation of the prelate's expressions? How skilfully does he arm every word to attack and lash his conduct? How artfully does he palliate the charges laid against the sectaries; and censure, severely censure, the advocates of the established orthodox church? I shall therefore shew that Cyprian may be cleared from several of our author's unjust reflections.

If we are to credit the relation of Cyprian, we find a black character given of *Felicissimus*, and of his heretical associates *Fortunatus*, *Novatus*, &c. that he was “ † an enemy of Christ, no new one, “ but long ago separated,” from the church, “ for “ his many and heinous crimes; a defrauder of “ money entrusted to him; a debaucher of vir- “ gins, and a scandalous adulterer.”—Then follows the particular passage which our author has inserted in his history, to which, that his misrepre-

* See also the ungenerous, inadequate motives which our historian *cautiously* supposes *might* induce Cyprian to suffer martyrdom, p. 550.

† Cyprian. Epist. 59. edit. Oxon.

P. 126.—“ hostem Christi; non novum, sed jampridem ob
 “ crimina sua plurima et gravissima ablentum—pecunie sibi
 “ commissæ fraudator, raptor virginium, matrimoniorum
 “ multorum depopulator atque corruptor.”

†

sensation

entation may be more manifest, I shall oppose the literal translation of the whole connected paragraph in Cyprian.

“ But if these things be so, my beloved brother, that the audacity of the most wicked men is to be dreaded, and that iniquitous persons are suffered to accomplish, by rash and desperate actions, those things which they are not able to effect by justice and equity; the exertion of episcopacy is rendered vain, the sublime and divine power of governing the church becomes useless, nor can we longer continue to be Christians, if it is come to this pitch, that we are to be daunted by the threats and treachery of the most abandoned men.”

Our author, in this instance, has served Cyprian in the same manner, as he had before served Tertullian. He doth not, as a faithful interpreter would have done, translate the whole passage, but he picks out such parts of it as are best adapted to his purpose, of conveying to his reader a notion of unreasonable severity predominating in the prelate's conduct, while he industriously omits other parts of the passage in which the matter is explained. Surely this is not a mode of translation very consist-

“ Quod si ita res est, frater carissime, ut nequissimorum timeatur audacia, et quod mali jure atque equitate non possint, temeritate ac desperatione perficiant; actum est de Episcopatus vigore, et de ecclesie gubernandae sublimi ac divini potestate; nec Christiani ultra aut durare, aut esse jam possumus, si ad hoc ventum est, ut perditorum minas atque insidias pertimescamus.”

The words marked in a different character, are left out by Mr. Gibbon in his translation.

I may notice also the inaccurate reference of our Author to epist. 69. whereas this matter is contained in epist. 59. Fell's edition, Oxon. to which particular edition of Cyprian's works he refers us, note 82. cap. xvi.

ent with the vulgar ideas of good faith.—As our author transcribed the harsh expressions of Cyprian, he ought to have transcribed also the reasons which provoked him to use them. Both being blended in the same passage, they must both remain or fall together. In how concise and palliative a manner does our advocate for the sectaries translate the original words expressive of *great audacity, injustice, and iniquity*, by the softened term “*irregularities?*” Upon the whole, if the accusation of the bishop be strictly true, we must allow the propriety of his words and conduct. But if, through other motives, he deviates into calumny, and rash declamation, as some imagine*, it behoves us not to condemn these persons as heretics, before we have sufficient grounds for the charge. This must be granted, that whatever was the cause of the dispute, these persons had separated themselves from the established church, and thereby exposed themselves to the censure of its governors, whose authority they had disdained and shaken off.—However, even this construction will not clear Mr. G. from the charge of partial misrepresentation.

* Beausobre is an apologist for the heretics, as they are called.

Mosheim impartially observes, “that there were doubtless faults on both sides, and how far the Sectaries were culpable, we can form no proper judgment, as we have such an imperfect and partial representation of the case.”

De rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. sæc. iii. p. 500.

He elsewhere speaks of Cyprian, as “acting with a manly courage and propriety, and tempering severity with lenity, in the case of the *Libellatici*; and of those who had apostatized:” (de lapsis) yet, says he, “Cyprian proceeded to great extremities, in the contest with *Novatus* and *Felicissimus*.” Ibid. p. 450.

II.

"Cyprian," says Mr. G. "upon his conversion, had sold his gardens for the benefit of the poor. The indulgence of God (most probably the liberality of some Christian friends) restored them to him again." See Pontius, c. 15.

Our author, in this instance, as well as in several others, has inserted words in a parenthesis, which are not to be found in the writer to whom he appeals, as the learned reader will see by the note †, in which the original passage is transcribed. This seems to be done in order to throw an air of trivial absurd superstition on the circumstance.

III.

Mr. G. insists on "the inhuman Maximin's promiscuous massacre" being "*improperly called a persecution* †." And again he says, "notwithstanding the cruel disposition of Maximin, the effects of his resentment against the Christians were of a very local and temporary nature." For the truth of this remark, he quotes the authority of "Firmilianus §, a Cappadocian bishop of that age, who," says he, "gives a just and con-fined idea of this persecution."

Now although the promiscuous massacre might be improperly stiled a persecution; yet Firmilianus

* Note 83. c. xvi.

† Pontius vit. Cypriani, c. 15, p. 8. edit. Oxon.

"Et hi erant quotidiani actus destinati ad placentem Deo hostiam sacerdotis; cum ecce Proconsulis iussu ad hortos ejus (ad hortos irquam, quos inter initia fidei sue venditos, & Dei indulgentia restitutos, pro certo iterum in usus pauperum vendidisset, nisi invidiam de persecutione vitaret) cum militibus suis princeps repente subitavit."

1 P. 559.

§ Note 117. c. xvi. Firmilianus apud Cyprian, epist. 75.

relates*, that there really "arose a severe persecution against the Christians, however temporary or local it might be, on account of some natural calamities; as earthquakes," &c. of which the superstitious Pagans supposed them to be the cause. "Therefore," he says, "they were oppressed by many hardships and grievances." And, "to increase their wretchedness and misery, unusually distressing, a fierce and cruel persecutor was governor of the province. So that their only safety consisted in flying from the country."

It is not much to be wondered indeed, that our historian should speak of this persecution as being improperly so called; since with him, "exile, imprisonment, confiscation of goods and slavery in the mines, are but mild punishments†." He seems to look on no scene with abhorrence, which is not stained with blood, and covered with racks and gibbets. But the more humane and moderate reader may think it sufficiently dreadful, and that

* P. 222. edit. Oxon. "Ante viginti enim, & duos fere annos, temporibus post Alexandrum Imperatorem, multæ istius constitutiones & pressuræ acciderunt, vel in commune omnibus hominis, vel privatim Christianis; tunc etiam motus plurimi & frequentes extiterunt, ut per Cappadociam & per Pontum multa subruerent, quædam etiam civitates in profundum deciperent, disrupti soli hiati devorarentur, ut ex hoc persecutio quoque gravis adversus nos Christiani nomini fieret. Quæ post longam retro ætatis pacem repente oborta, de inopinato & insueto malo ad turbandum populum nostrum terribilior effecta est. Serenianus tunc fuit in nostra provincia Præses, acerbus & dirus persecutor. In hac autem perturbatione constituti fidelibus, & huc atque illuc persecutionis metu fugientibus, & patrias suas relinquentibus, atque in alias partes regionum transeuntibus (erat enim transeundi facultas, eo quod persecutio illa, non per totum mundum, sed localis fuisset), &c.

† P. 545, &c.

the severity of the persecution will compensate for its locality*.

There are some other instances of our author's misrepresentation of Cyprian, on the supremacy said to be given by the ancients to the church of Rome. But these, for the sake of connection, I shall give with those of other authors misrepresented on this subject.

Misrepresentations of ORIGEN.

I might retort on our historian the accusation which he has falsely laid against Origen, "of mutilating the objections of his adversary†." But the charge has been so fully proved against Mr. G. by the able author of the remarks on his history‡, that it would be a needless repetition. I pass on, therefore, to what our author says on "the meanness and ignorance of the first Christians," which he tells us, with an apparent pleasure and satisfaction, was "*a very odious imputation, which seems to be less strenuously denied by the apologists, than it is urged by the adversaries of the faith§.*"

I shall now lay before the reader, a convincing proof that Mr. G. has added falsehood to "*this unfavourable picture||*," by saying, that "*this charge,*

* It is thus the learned Dodwell speaks of this persecution; Dissert. xi. §1. and thereby gives a much more adequate idea of it, than what Mr. G. has inaccurately copied from him, as will be shewn hereafter, can well give.

† Note 101. c. xv.

‡ P. 28.

§ P. 513.

|| Our author well observes, that "*this unfavourable picture*," which has but "*a faint resemblance*" to recommend

“ charge, this odious imputation, *was not strenuously denied* by the apologists.” He has referred us but to one * for a proof of his words; I might alledge the testimony of others † to prove the reverse. However, I am content to keep to Origen, the one which he has singled out, and doubt not but I shall fully prove that this apologist has *most strenuously denied* the chief accusation of Celsus, that “ the obscure Christian teachers were as mute in public, as they were loquacious and dogmatical in private. Whilst they cautiously avoided the philosophers, they mingled with the rude and illiterate croud ‡.”

Origen having previously observed, that “ many of the philosophers of Greece embraced Christianity, on account of that *gracefulness* which manifested itself therein, not only to slaves, as Celsus intimated, but to persons of such superior judgment ||;” goes on to confute the charge in these words :

mend it, “ betrays by its dark colouring and distorted features the pencil of an enemy.” May we not then ask Mr. G. if he has not passed a sentence of condemnation on himself, in reviving and bringing to the light this distorted portraiture?

* Note 182. c. xv: Celsus ap. Origen, l. iii. p. 138.—142.

† Dr. Watson (Apology, p. 151) has given us the authority of Jerome and Arnobius to contradict the malicious accusation. The reader will find this, and the several other important charges alledged against the First Christians by the Pagans, well accounted for by Turner. See his *Calumnies on the primitive Christians*.

‡ Origen observes, one chief rise of this opinion was the perverse interpretation of that passage in Scripture; “ not many wise, not many noble, not many rich, &c. were called” to the faith: they therefore concluded, that no wise, no noble, no learned persons embraced Christianity.

|| Origen contra Celsum, 4to edit. Hoefschelius, p. 121.

ἐπὶ ΣΕΜΝΟΝ τι ἰφάνη τοῖς ἀνδραποδισταῖς, ὡς οὐκ αἰσχροῖς, οὐκ ὡς οὐκ αἰσχροῖς, οὐκ ὡς οὐκ αἰσχροῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήνων φιλοσοφῶν.

“ How

" How can Celsus with any decency reproach
 " us, as saying, let no learned, no wise, no pru-
 " dent person come into our society ; yea indeed,
 " let the learned, the wise, and the prudent man,
 " who is willing, enter among us : Yet, neverthe-
 " less, if there be any unlearned, unwise, unin-
 " structed, illiterate, let him come also ; for such,
 " when they embrace the faith, the word promises
 " to heal, rendering them all worthy of God. But
 " it is a rank falsity to say, that the teachers of the
 " gospel choose to persuade the foolish alone, and the
 " ignoble, and the insensible, and slaves, and women,
 " and children : These also the Word calls, to make
 " them better ; but it invites also those that are
 " superior to them. For Christ is the Saviour of
 " all men, particularly of the faithful, whether
 " they be wise or simple +."

Again he says, " See in what a manner Celsus
 " falsely accuses us, in comparing us to quacks and
 " itinerant praters, who hold forth in market-
 " places. But what silly babbling do we utter ? or
 " in what respect is our conduct like theirs ? For
 " we, by our reading, and explanations of what
 " we read, would exhort men wholly to the wor-
 " ship of God, and the practice of virtue ; and

† P. 141. (Spencer, edit. Cantab. 1658) οὕτως οὖν ἐν λόγῳ
 ἔγκλει ὁ Κέλσος ἡμῖν ὡς φάσκουσιν " μηδὲν προσίτω πεπαιδευμένος,
 " μηδὲν σοφός, μηδὲν φρόνιμος· ἀλλὰ προσίτω μὴ πεπαιδευμένος καὶ
 " σοφός καὶ φρόνιμος, ὁ βουλούμενος· οὐδεὶς δ' ἔστω προσίτω καὶ ἢ τις
 " ἀμαθὴς καὶ αἰήτος καὶ ἀπαιδευτός, καὶ ἡλίθιος, καὶ γὰρ τοὺς τοιοῦτους
 " προσελθόντας ἐπαγγέλλεται θεραπεύειν ὁ λόγος, πάντας ἀξίους
 " κατισχυμῆσαι τοῦ Θεοῦ· ΤΕΤΑΘΕ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ, ΜΟΝΟΤΕ
 " ἡλιθίους καὶ αἰήτους καὶ ἀπαιδευτούς καὶ ἀνδράποδα, καὶ γυναῖκα, καὶ
 " παῖδας ΠΕΙΘΕΙΝ ΕΘΕΛΕΙΝ ΤΟΤΕ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΟΝΤΑΣ
 " ΤΟΝ ΘΕΙΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ." καὶ τοῦτο μὴ γὰρ καλεῖ ὁ λόγος, ἵνα
 αὐτοὺς βελτιώσῃ· καλεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς τούτων διαφύοντας· ἵνα
 ΣΥΤΕΡΕΣ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΕΣΤΩ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΙ ὁ Χριστός, καὶ μάλα καὶ πιστῶν, ὥστε συντελεῖν,
 ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν.

" would

“ would deter them from despising the Deity, and
 “ from doing all things contrary to sound reason *.”

But as I need not multiply proofs to detain my
 reader, though Origen continues on the vindication
 for several pages, I shall only add, that he once
 more asserts,

“ We Christians exert our utmost endeavours,
 “ that our assembly should be filled with wise and
 “ judicious men; and we are then bold to intro-
 “ duce in our public reasonings, those things which
 “ are esteemed most good and sacred, when we are
 “ crowded with hearers of understanding †,” &c.

I now appeal to the reader, if the power of
 language can express, in a more emphatical man-
 ner, that “ *the odious imputation was most strenuous-*
 “ *ly denied by the apologists.*” With what assurance
 then could our historian cite the authority of Ori-
 gen to confirm a charge which he labours to inva-
 lidate *?

That many of the primitive Christians were of
 the lower class of people, cannot be denied. Our

* “Ὅρα δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἡμῶν ΣΥΚΟΦΑΝΤΕΙΣ ἱερομαχίαν
 τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς τὰ ἐκτελέσσοντα ἐπιδικνύμενοις καὶ ἀγέλους ποιοῦ-
 ῖν ἐκτελέσσοντα ἐπιδικνύμεθα; ἢ τὸ πύττος παραπλήσιον πράττομεν;
 Οἱ καὶ δι’ ἀναγνώσματος, καὶ διατόνων εἰς τὰ
 ἀναγνώσματα διηγεσέων ἀποτρέποντες μὴ ἐπὶ τῇ εἰς τοῦ
 Θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων νοείῃ, καὶ ταῖς συνδρομαῖς ταύτης ἀρετᾶς ἀποτρέπον-
 τες δι’ αὐτὸ τοῦ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ πάντων τῶν παρὰ τὸν
 ὁρθὸν λόγον πραττομένων; &c.

† ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ὅση δύναμις, πάντα πράττομεν ὡς τοῦ προσημῶν
 ἀνδρῶν γινώσκειν τὸν σύλλογον ἡμῶν. καὶ τὰ ἐν ὑμῶν μέλητα κατὰ καὶ διὰ
 τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν διαλόγους φέρειν εἰς μέσον, ὅτι
 ἐκπορεύμενοι τῶν ἀρετῶν, &c.

Origen tells us also, that “ a strict examination was
 “ made into the morals of the Christians; and that persons
 “ were appointed to inquire into the former conduct, and
 “ principles of every one, before he was admitted into the
 “ Christian Congregation.” This proves, that not every cri-
 minal or profligate could gain admission into the Christian so-
 ciety at his pleasure, as Mr. G. asserts, p. 479, 480.

author

author has well accounted for it*. Yet still it will not admit of a doubt, if we have any regard to the truth of history, both sacred and profane, but that the apostles, and their successors, addressed themselves to emperors and princes, and disputed with orators and philosophers, as well as preached to the mechanic and slave: "King Agrippa was *almost* persuaded," by the reasoning of St. Paul, "to become a Christian." And Felix, though a governor, "trembled" at his authoritative reproof. His eloquence was more than a counterbalance for the rhetoric of Tertullus, and Athens was puzzled by, and astonished at, his understanding.

Julian the Emperor was made to know, by these mean and ignorant Christians, the danger of his apostacy; and Constantine was converted to the faith. The Empress Mammoea did not disdain to listen to "the eloquent exhortations of Origen," and her son Alexander favoured the Christians.

These effects were not to be brought about by "private loquacity," or silly babbling; nor "by mingling with the rude and illiterate crowd" alone. The disciples of Christ "*preached aloud, upon the house-tops,*" disputed in the learned synagogues, and harangued in the public streets and market places. This they did, though reprov'd, though punished for their conduct, and still did they persist in spite of human authority, and opposition. In fact, these obscure illiterate

* "Such is the constitution of civil society, that whilst a few persons are distinguished by riches, by honours, and by knowledge, the body of the people is condemned to obscurity, ignorance, and poverty. The Christian religion, which addressed itself to the whole human race, must consequently collect a far greater number of proselytes from the lower than from the superior ranks of life." P. 513.

teachers

teachers spoke too publicly for the eloquence of infidelity, and reasoned too powerfully for the philosophy of paganism.

II.

But Origen furnishes Mr. G. with another piece of censure, which he expresses in a note*.

“ It may be hoped, that none, except the heretics, gave occasion to the complaint of Celsus, (ap. Origen, l. ii. p. 77.) that the Christians were *perpetually* correcting their gospels.”

In opposition to this reflection, I shall content myself with fairly stating the accusation of *Celsus* himself, which, however malignant and groundless, does not authorise our historian to say, that “ the Christians were *perpetually* correcting their gospels.” The translation of his words is this :

“ Afterwards, Celsus says, that *some of the believers*, as if they were inebriated, allowed themselves to alter the gospel from its first copy ; and this, *three, or four, or even many times* : and that they transformed it to have wherewith to deny the accusations alledged against them. But I know of *no others*,” replies Origen, “ that altered the gospel, than the Marcionites, and Valentinians, and I think also the Lucanians. However, this charge we are speaking of does not affect the gospel itself, but relates to those only who have dared to *erase and corrupt it* †.”

We

* Note 185, c. xv.

† Origen, lib. II. p. 77. Spencer Ed.

μετά ταυτα “ τῶας τῶν πισυνόντων φησὶν ὡς ἐκ μὲνους ἀκρίτας εἰς τὸ
“ ἐφιστάειν αὐτοῖς, μεταχαρατῆιν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ ἐναγγέλιον.
“ ΤΡΙΧΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΕΤΡΑΧΗ, ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΛΑΧΗ. καὶ μεταλλάττει,
“ ὡς ἔχουσιν πρὸς τοὺς ἰδεγχοὺς ἀρεῖσθαι.” ΜΕΤΑΧΑΡΑΨΑΝΤΑΣ
ΔΕ ΤΟ ἘΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ἌΛΛΟΥΣ ΟὔΤΚ ΟἶΔΑ, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ
Μαρκιανῶν

We here see that Celsus himself only accuses *some* of the believers of altering the gospels; and who they were Origen informs us, strictly confining the charge to particular heretics*.—And as the heathens seldom made a distinction between the heretics and the orthodox Christians, the accusation is easily accounted for: Yet Mr. G. would convey to his reader the idea, that Celsus extended "*his complaint of perpetually correcting the gospels*" to the Christians in general, as if it had been a practice *perpetually* adopted by the whole body of believers. A charge this much to our author's favourite purpose of drawing a most odious picture of the religion of Christ.

"The learned Origen," says Mr. G. "who from his experience as well as reading, was intimately acquainted with the history of the Christians, declares in the most express terms, that the number of martyrs was very considerable †. But the general assertion of Origen may be explained and confirmed by the particular testimony of his friend Dionysius, who in the immense city of Alexandria, and under the rigorous persecution of Decius, reckons only ten men and seven women who

Μαρκίανος, καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου, εἶμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Λουκίου. τοῦτο δὲ λεγόμενον οὐ τοῦ λόγου ἕνεκα, ἀλλὰ τῶν ταλαιπωρούντων ἐραδιουργῆσαι τὰ εὐαγγέλια.

* Eusebius (l. v. 28.) is also referred to by Mr. G., chiefly I should suppose in confirmation of the observations in the text of his history. At least, the words of Eusebius, "they fearlessly altered the sacred Scriptures," *γραφὰς μὲν διὰς ἀφόβως ἐραδιουργήκασιν*, can relate to the heretics alone of whom he had been speaking.

Beausobre, Histoire de Manichée, &c. (tom. i. c. iv. § 2. p. 306, &c.) though a strenuous advocate for the sectaries, allows the truth of this charge.

† P. 546 and note 71. c. xvi. Origen advers. Celsum, l. iii. p. 116.

"suffered

"suffered for the profession of the Christian name."

It has been already judiciously observed by the author of the remarks †, that the testimony of Origen is *insufficient* to prove the above assertion: which therefore may be considered as a third instance of our author's misrepresentation of that Father.

I mean now to shew that his eager desire to lessen the number of martyrs, has not permitted him to give the testimony of Dionysius fairly and impartially as it stands in Eusebius.

Misrepresentations of EUSEBIUS.

The testimony of this historian is appealed to by Mr. G †, in confirmation of his assertion "that the number of martyrs was very inconsiderable."

Our author is not very accurate in giving the exact number of the martyrs, specified by name in Eusebius, when "he reckons them to be only ten men and seven women:" But a matter of this little consequence I shall not insist upon.

Let us rather notice, what is much more material, that he only enumerates those persons who are *expressly said to have lost their lives*; concealing from us, that in the same place mention is made of *several who underwent the severest tortures*. For instance, four Christians, in particular, are said to have been *delivered up to the magistrate* ‡: And Dionysius speaks also of "a whole band of soldiers, who presented themselves before the tribunal,

† P. 69. "Because Origen lived before the time of the longest and severest persecutions which the Church experienced," namely, "those of Decius and Diocletian."

‡ Note 74. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. vi. c. 41.

‡ Hero, Ater, Ilidorus, and Dioscorus, *παρ' ἑαυτοὺς*.

" and

“ and professed openly that they were Christians *.” We read then, “ although the soldiers thus rushing in, affrightened the judges and the court, yet *they made the condemned Christians more ready and courageous to bear their sufferings †.*” By this we should understand, they were destined to cruel torments, if not to death itself.—I might too insist on the many intimations there are of others, whom death released from their severe servitude and lingering tortures. I might observe, that he speaks of many whose stronger constitutions could bear the oppressive burden; or who, in the *benevolent* language of Mr. G., suffered “ *only the milder punishments of exile, imprisonment, slavery, or working in the mines ‡,*” with which their *humane* magistrates were content to punish them. Very different then would be the number of these suffering martyrs. But that many more Christians laid down their lives in so long and severe a persecution than those who are here specified by name, is plainly demonstrable from the narration of this historian. It was not for Mr. G.’s purpose, to acquaint his reader with this. As a few in number were particularly pointed out by name, it afforded him a specious pretext for bringing in Dionysius, as affirming that no others had suffered. However, as a second misrepresentation,

II.

Our author, happy to have an opportunity of shewing that a zealous professor of Christianity

* Ἀποφ' ὧν δὲ τὸ σύνταγμα στρατιωτικόν, Ἀρμενίᾳ Ζήνῳ καὶ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ Ἰγνίῳ καὶ οὖν αὐτοῖς προσβύτης Θιόφιλος, ἐπέταξε πρὸ τοῦ διαμαρτυρεῖν.

† καὶ τοὺς μὴ κενωμένους ὑδαρσιγῶνους. “ ad ea quæ perpassuri erant promptissimi et confidentissimi: says Valeſius.

‡ Page 545.

F

could

could at the same time lead a very profligate life, has taken special care to select from the number of these martyrs, one, who "was likewise accused of robbery," to use his own words*. But the Greek historian here makes an essential addition: "† He was accused indeed, but *falsely*," says he, "as being an associate with thieves: He was acquitted," continues he, "of this most foreign and malicious charge, and being indicted, because he was a Christian, was burnt to death among the other criminals."

One can hardly think, that any one, who had looked into the original, would dare thus absolutely to contradict the plain testimony of the author he *pretends* to follow.

For Mr. G. should be reminded, that the original word *συκοφαντην* means, "he was *falsely* accused;" it is translated by Valesius † (whose edition he uses), "*falso* accusatus fuerat," and properly, as § Scapula and Budæus will inform him:

* Note 74. c. xvi.

Dionysius (apud Euseb. l. vi. c. 41.)

† Νιμυσίων δὲ τις, καλεῖσθαι Αἰγύπτιος· ΕΣΥΚΟΦΑΝΤΗΘΗ ΜΕΝ, ὡς δὲ σύνδικος ληστῶν· ΑΠΟΔΥΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ Δ' Ε ΤΑΥΤΗΝ παρὰ τῶ ἱκανοτέρῳ ΤΗΝ ἈΛΛΟΤΡΙΠΤΑΤΗΝ ΚΑΤ' ΑΤΤΟΥ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΗΝ· ΚΑΤΑΜΗΝΤΟΕΙΣ ΩΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΟΣ, ὡς δὲ μαρτυρῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἡγούμενον. ὁ δὲ ἀδικώτατος διπλᾶς αὐτῷ ἢ τοῖς λησταῖς ταῖς τε βασάνους καὶ ταῖς μαστίαις λυμναζόμενος, μετὰ τῶν ληστῶν κατέφλεξε.

‡ Page 240.

§ Scapula translates the word *συκοφαντιῶν* "*falso* criminor; "I am *falsely* charged with a crime." Budæus says (p. 13.), that this verb is used "when we speak of an *innocent* person; "qui de *insonto* dicitur." It is made use of in this acceptation also in the New Testament, the style of which the Fathers generally imitated; for a part of St. John the Baptist's charge to the soldiers (Luke iii. 14.) is *μὴδὲ συκοφαντίζετε*, "neither accuse any one *falsely*." The above are evident proofs that it can be taken in no other sense.

I

But

But above all, what Eusebius himself subjoins, though our impartial historian thinks proper to conceal it from us, that "this very person was acquitted of the false accusation, even before the censure, his enemy," must at once clear up every doubt of the kind.

What possible evasion then can Mr. G. have recourse to, to convince the world that I have *falsely* accused him of a gross misrepresentation of Eusebius?

III.

Our historian says, "The bishops of the most considerable cities were removed by exile, or death; the vigilance of the magistrates prevented the clergy of Rome during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election." From this he appeals to Eusebius.

Yet this Father says only, that "in the persecution of Decius, when Fabianus, bishop of Rome, suffered martyrdom in that city, Cornelius was elected to his bishopric." So that Mr. G. has no reason to say, from the testimony of Eusebius, that "the clergy of Rome were prevented, during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election."

It should be remarked likewise, that Eusebius imputes the resentment, by which Decius was actuated against the favourites of his predecessor Philip, to be the cause of his raising this per-

* Page 360.

† Note 121. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. vi. c. 39.

‡ ὁ Φαβιανὸς ἐπὶ Ρώμης μαρτυρῶν τελευτήσας Κορνήλιος τὸν ἐπισκοπὸν διαδέχεται.

§ ὁ δὲ Δι (Decius) τοῦ πρὸς Φίλιππον ἔχοντος ἐνκαταγωγῆς κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἰσχυρῶς.

secution against the church. Now this is directly contrary to the assertion of our author *.

IV.

"The revolt of Maxentius," as Mr. G. asserts, "immediately restored peace to the churches of Italy and Africa, and the same tyrant, who oppressed every other class of his subjects, shewed himself just, humane, and even partial towards the afflicted Christians†."

In support of this, he appeals ‡ to Eusebius, and continues his note in these words: "But as Maxentius was vanquished by Constantine, *it suited the purpose* of Lactantius to place his death among those of the persecutors."

Our author here, in the strain of Middleton, introduces his favourite expression *it suited the purpose* of Lactantius, in order to insinuate to his readers that this father, as well as the others, was ready at all times, without the least regard to truth, to adopt any fact that tended to promote the design he had in view. I need not however dwell on this, as I have something of greater consequence to remark; which is, although Mr. G. represents these two Fathers, as contradicting each other in their accounts, yet this is so far from being true, that the testimony of Eusebius coincides with, and corroborates, that of Lactantius. For Eusebius says, "Although Maxentius at first favoured the Christians with a view of popularity, yet afterwards, being addicted to magic and every other iniquity,

* Page 560. "The virtues of Decius will scarcely allow us to suspect that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor, &c."

† Page 577.

‡ Note 167. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14.

“ he exerted himself in persecuting the Christians,
 “ in a more severe and destructive manner than
 “ his predecessors had done before him*.”

From these words it appears, that not only Lactantius, but Eusebius also, ranks this emperor amongst the number of the persecutors. This being the case, Mr. G. must quote other authority to prove “ *the justice, humanity, and kind partiality of*
 “ *Maxentius towards the afflicted Christians.*” But surely if he had been acquainted with any such authority, he would not have exposed himself to the charge, which I now bring against him, that it *served*
his purpose here to falsify the testimony of Eusebius.

V.

Our author, unwilling to interrupt the long calm of prosperity which he describes the church as enjoying, by any violent act of the emperor Aurelian; would have us be of opinion, that “ only
 “ some hostile intentions are to be attributed to that
 “ emperor †.”

To corroborate this, he cites the testimony of several of the Fathers; but says, “ their language
 “ is in general so ambiguous and incorrect, that
 “ we are at a loss to determine how far Aurelian
 “ had carried his intentions before he was assassi-
 “ nated ‡.”

* Eusebius Hist. Eccles. l. viii. c. 14.

τότου τοῦ Μαξιαντίου — ἀρχόμενος μὲν τῶ καθ' ἡμᾶς πρίν
 ἐν ἀρεσσίᾳ καὶ καλοσίᾳ τοῦ δήμου Ῥωμαίων καθυπεκρίνατο, ταῦτα
 τε τοῖς ὑπακοῦσι τῶν κατὰ χριστιανῶν ἀνέλαι προβάτῳ διαγρῶν, ἐν-
 δεικνύων ἐπιμορφᾶν — οὐ μὲν οἷος εἶσθαι ἡλπίσθη, τοῦτοτος ἔργου
 ἀναπύσθαι. Eusebius then describes his cruelties and acts of
 wickedness; and after taking particular notice of his being
 strongly inclined to magic arts, he says, οὐ γὰρ καὶ τῷ καθ'
 ἡμῶν σφοδρότερος ἢ οἱ πρόσθεν καὶ πυνάτεροι ἐπιτίθετο διαγρῶν.

† Page 561.

‡ Note 124. c. xvi.

However, one of the authorities he appeals to, Hieronymus in Chron. p. 177, makes against his assertion, by saying, "When Aurelian had raised a persecution against the Christians, a thunder-bolt rushed down near him and his attendants, and not long after he died *."

This plainly implies much more than *hostile intentions*: It absolutely says, that a persecution was begun by him, and speaks of the time past, as if he was deterred by this circumstance from pursuing these hostile measures. Our author has not only thus perverted the fact, but also has been guilty of a gross blunder, in quoting the Chronicon of Jerome, instead of that of Eusebius, which he should have called it; Jerome being only the interpreter of it. This was the consequence of his looking no farther than Dodwell for this remark, and not rightly understanding his reference.

VI.

Mr. G. says, "On some particular occasions," "when the magistrates were exasperated by some personal motives of interest or resentment, when the zeal of the martyrs urged them to forget the rules of prudence, and perhaps of decency, to overturn altars, to pour out imprecations against the emperors †, or to strike the judge as he sat

* Eusebii Cæsar. Chronicon, D. Hieronymo Interprete. Ed. per Janssonium.

P. 177. "Aurelianus cum adversum nos persecutionem movisset, fulmen juxta eum comitumque ejus ruit, ac non multo post — occiditur."

† This is far from being compatible with the truth of history: For we know from the authority of Tertollian, and other Fathers; nay, from Mr. G.'s own words, that the Christians always prayed for the safety and welfare of the Emperors and of the State.

“ on his tribunal, it may be presumed that every
 “ mode of torture, which cruelty could invent, or
 “ constancy could endure, was exhausted on those
 “ devoted victims *.”

To illustrate this, he adds the following note †:
 “ The behaviour of Ædesius to Hierocles, præfect
 “ of Egypt, was still more extraordinary, λογοις
 “ *τε και εργοις* † τον δικαστην περιβαλων.
 “ Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 5.”

We cannot but remark the partiality of this account. Mr. G. takes care to omit the reasons or provocations assigned in this very passage by Eusebius, which might be some justification of the behaviour of Ædesius.

Eusebius, speaking of that judge, says, “ § he
 “ not only punished the Christians beyond the li-
 “ mits of his power, but treated the most venera-
 “ ble men with every varied disgrace; violating
 “ the chastity of the Christian virgins, and women
 “ of the utmost modesty, by delivering them up
 “ to be defiled and prostituted by whoremongers.”

* Page 583.

† Note. 178. c. xvi.

‡ This word *εργος* is forcibly rendered *striking* by Mr. G. in his text; but a candid reader might well understand it, from the sense and connection of the whole passage, to imply only some menacing gesture.

§ Eusebius de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 5.

σμηκὸν τῷ χρόνῳ ὕειρον — Ἀδίσιος. μετὰ μνείας ὅσας ὁμολο-
 γίας ἢ πολυχρόνους δειμῶν κακίαις. ἡγεμονικὰς τε αποβάσεις, ἐν αἷς
 ταῖς κατὰ παλαιότητα δόδοι μεταλλοῖς, — τελευταῖον δὲ τῆς
 Ἀδελφείας πόλεως τῷ αὐτῷ συνδόν διακτὴν Χριστιανῶν διακίοντα,
 πρὸς τὴν ἀποστασίαν ἐμπροσθεντα. ἢ τότε μὲν οὐκ αὖτις ἀνδράσι
 ποικίλως ἐνδρίζοντα. τότε δὲ γυναῖκας σφοδρῶν τῆς αὐτῶν ἢ
 αὐτοπαρθέτους ἀσκητείας εἰς αἰσχρὰς ὕδασι ποροτρόφους παραδίδουσα.
 ταυτὸν ἐγγχειρήσας τῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅτι δὲ ἀφόρητα ἵναι αὐτὴν τὰ
 γινόμενα ἴδουσι, παραστήματα δαρσαλῶν ἀρσένων. λόγους τε ἢ ἔργους τὸν
 διακτὴν αἰσχρῶν ἢ αἰτιμῶν περιβαλὼν, καὶ τούτοις κακίαις ἐν
 μέγα βασάνῃ πολυτρόπους ὑπομένειν αἰκίας, τῶν ἀδελφικῶν ἀπηνί-
 κητα, θαλάττῃ παραδοθὲς τελευταῖον.

F 4

“ On

“ On beholding these intolerable grievances
 “ the courageous Ædelsius approached with mag-
 “ nanimous confidence, and by *his words and ac-*
 “ *tions raised in the judge both shame and disgrace:*
 “ For which, being seized and fettered, he en-
 “ dured with constancy every torture,” which
 cruelty could invent, “ and was at last thrown into
 “ the sea.”

This being the case, it became Mr. G. to lay it open before us; it was his duty, as an *impartial* historian, not to have left the reader at liberty to imagine the insult was unprovoked. For, on viewing the horrible picture here given of the judge, the behaviour of Ædelsius will not appear to be *so very extraordinary* as our author would represent it: But we are almost tempted to applaud his zeal.

VII.

“ Each of these sects,” (namely, “ of the Gnos-
 “ tics, the Basilidians *, the Valentinians, the Mar-
 “ cionites, and the Manicheans,”) says Mr. G.
 “ could boast of its doctors and martyrs †.” To
 confirm this he cites the authority of Eusebius ‡.

Now the chapter referred to by Mr. G. in Va-
 lesius's edition, “ treats principally of the martyr-
 “ dom of Polycarp §: One Germanicus also is
 “ particularly mentioned: And twelve other Chris-
 “ tians, Eusebius tells us, were martyred together

* Mr. G. seems to speak very inconsistently with this in his note on this passage, where he says, “ Some of the Gnostics, (the Basilidians) it seemed, declined and even refused the “ honour of Martyrdom.” How then could these same Basilidians be said to boast of their martyrs?

† Page 462.

‡ Note 33. c. xv. Eusebius Hist. Ecclesiast. l. iv. c. 15.

§ P. 129. Vales. Ed. τούτοις ἑξῆς πρὸ τῆς ἀμφὶ τοῦ Πολυκάρπου διηγήσεως τὰ κατὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀνιστορούσι μάρτυρας.

“ with

“ with Polycarp *. One Marcionite is instanced as
 “ crowned with martyrdom, and another man
 “ named Pionus †.” These are all that are re-
 corded by the historian; and no mention is made
 of any sect but that of Marcion.

We now see that Eusebius does not give our au-
 thor those sufficient grounds for his remark, which
 he would represent him as giving.

Nay elsewhere, when Eusebius says that “ many
 “ of the followers of Marcion had suffered martyr-
 “ dom ‡,” he does not intimate that the other sects
 could boast of their martyrs: Nor is he quoted
 even by Beausobre §, the great apologist for the
 sectaries, in a more extensive view than relating to
 the Marcionites. It is more probable, therefore,
 that the thought was suggested to our author by
 Beausobre in the above passage, or else by Bayle,
 whom he here quotes, and whose words are not
 very unlike Mr. G.’s “ They boasted of their pre-
 “ tended martyrs.” The long note which Bayle
 has on this subject, might readily furnish him with
 the reference to Eusebius.

VIII.

Our author refers to Eusebius for a passage, to
 which his reference does not direct us. His words

* P. 135.—ταῦτα τὰ κατὰ τὸ μακάριον Πολύκαρπον οὐ-
 ταὶ ἀπὸ Φιλαδελφίας δόδωκα, τοῦ ἐν Ἑμέρῃ μαρτυρήσαντος.

† ἢ ἄλλα μαρτύρια συνῆστο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Ἑμέραν ἀπεργα-
 μένα ὑπὸ τῇ αὐτῇ περιόδῳ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς τοῦ Παλαιάρχου μαρτυρίας;
 μὴ δὲ ἢ ΜΗΤΡΩΔΩΡΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤ’ Α ΜΑΡΚΙΩΝΑ ΠΛΑΨΗΣ.
 πρὸς οὗτος δὲ εἶναι δίκαιον ἀπὸ παραδοχῆς ἀνέχεσθαι, τῶν γὰρ μὴ τότε
 περιβόητος μέγας ἢ τις ἐγνωρίζετο Πιόνος.

‡ Eusebius Hist. Ecclesiast. l. v. c. 16.

οἱ περτοὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ Μαρκιανῆος αἰρέσεως——αλίηνου ὄντος ὅχιον
 Χριστοῦ μαρτυρίας λέγουσι.

§ Histoire de Manichée, &c. tom. ii. livre iv, c. 8. § 3.

are,

are, "But he" (Plavius Clemens) "had scarcely finished the term of his annual magistracy, when, on a slight pretence, he was condemned and executed. Domitilla (the wife of Clemens, the niece of Domitian) was banished to a desolate island on the coast of Campania;" &c. To illustrate this passage, he adds the following note, (52. c. xvi.) "The Isle of Pandataria, according to Dion. Brutius Præfens (ap. Euseb. iii. 18.) banishes her to that of Pontia, which was not far distant from the other," &c.

In opposition to this, as an additional instance of our author's misrepresentation, I assure the reader, that there is no mention made of Brutius Præfens in Eusebius, lib. iii. c. 18. (see Valesius' edition.) Can we think it probable then, that any person who had consulted Eusebius, would have made such an assertion? or how can we excuse such a vain affectation of learning? I doubt not but I shall be able hereafter to account for this error, to the satisfaction of the reader.

I shall close these proofs of our author's unfair quotations of Eusebius, by the following reflection:

Whatever may be thought of the accusation thrown out by Mr. G. against this historian, of "*suppressing* all that could tend to the disgrace of religion†;" surely every body must agree, though Mr. G. himself does not confess it, that, by the artful management of his quotations, as we have seen in the above instances, he suppresses whatever might do credit to religion.

* Page 539.

† See the vindication of Eusebius from this asperssion by the author of the remarks, p. 70 and 76, &c.

Misrepresentation of JUSTIN MARTYR.

Mr. G. in tracing the "three methods of escaping martyrdom," begins with the following as the first: Justin's case is not an example of the

of a modern inquisitor would hear with surprise, that whenever an information was given to a Roman magistrate of any person within his jurisdiction who had embraced the sect of the Christians, the charge was committed to the party accused, and that a convenient time was allowed him to settle his domestic concerns, and to prepare an answer to the crime that was imputed to him *.

In confirmation of this account he says, that, in the second apology of Justin, there is a particular and very curious instance of this legal delay †.

The reader will observe, that Mr. G. does not make a particular reference to any section or division of this part of Justin's works; with what view, we may shrewdly suspect, when I tell him, that, after an accurate perusal of the whole second apology, I can boldly affirm, that the following instance is the only one that bears the most distant similitude to what Mr. G. relates as above on the authority of Justin.

What I find in Justin is as follows: "A woman being converted to Christianity, is afraid to associate with her husband, because he is an abandoned reprobate, lest she should partake of his sins. Her husband not being able to accuse her, vents his rage in this manner on one Ptolemæus, a teacher of Christianity, and who had converted

* Page 553.

† Note 98. c. xvi.

" her.

“ her. The Centurion being his friend, throws
 “ Ptolemæus into prison, and is afterwards per-
 “ suaded to bring him forth, and to put the usual
 “ question to him, *whether he is a Christian*, or
 “ not? Then, upon his true and faithful confes-
 “ sion, that he was a Christian, the Centurion *caused*
 “ *him to be fettered*, and he was *punished* in prison
 “ *for a long time* *.”

Shall this then be called “ *an instance of legal de-
 “ lay?*” a delay of punishment it could not be, for
 he was not only *confined for a long time*, but was
chastised, or *tortured* during his imprisonment;
 nay, even previous to his trial. Is there any thing
 said here of “ *the charge being communicated to the*
 “ *party accused?* or *was there any time allotted him*
 “ *to settle his domestic concerns?*” Why then does
 Mr. G. attempt to obtrude upon us a sentiment of
 his own, as that of Justin? Though he takes every
 opportunity to pass encomiums on the *humanity* of
 the Roman magistrates, it is incumbent on him to
 produce better evidence than this of their being
 content to put in force only their *milder* punish-
 ments, as he is pleased to stile them; lest, when the
 comparison is drawn between them and the modern
 inquisitor, it should not appear to be much in their
 favour.

* Justin Martyr. Apolog. ii.

ὁ δὲ ταύτης ποτὶ αἰῆς, πρὸς ἐκίνη μὴ μὴ δυνάμενος ταῦτι ἔτι
 λέγειν, πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τινα, ὃν Οὐρβίκιος ἐκολάσατο, διδασκαλὸν
 ἐκίνης τῶν χριστιανῶν μαθημάτων γινόμενον, ἑτραπέτο, διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ
 τρόπου. ἑκατόνταρχος εἰς δίσμα ἰμεινόμενον τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φίλον αὐτῷ
 υπαρχοντα, ἔπεισε λαβίσθαι τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἢ ἀπερῆσαι ἐν αὐτῷ
 τοῦτο μόνον χριστιανὸς ἐστὶ ἢ τὸν Πτολεμαῖον, φιλαλήθη ἀλλ' οὐκ
 ἀπατηλὸν ὑπὸ ψευδολόγοι τῇ γάμῃ ὄντα, ὁμολογήσαντα ἑαυτὸν
 ἰνδὶ χριστιανὸν, ἐν δίσμοις γίνεσθαι ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος πτωπύνας, ἢ ἐπὶ
 πολλῶν χρόνων ἐν τῷ δίσματι γίνεσθαι. Ed. Thirlby, p. 109.

Misrepresentation of OPTATUS.

On the authority of this Father, Mr. G. informs us he makes the following note: "The ancient monuments published at the end of Optatus, p. 261, &c. describe in a very circumstantial manner, the proceedings of the governors in the destruction of churches. They made a minute inventory of the plate, &c. which they found in them. That of the church of Cirta, in Numidia, is still extant. It consisted of two chalices of gold, and six of silver: six urns, one kettle, seven lamps, all likewise of silver; besides a large quantity of brass utensils, and wearing apparel *."

Mr. G. in the preceding note had referred to *Dupin's* edition of Optatus; we therefore justly expect him to adhere to it in this note: But I do not find *any* of the above particulars specified at page 261 in *Dupin's* edition †, and only *some* of them in other places.

In the annotations of Balduinus, where he is speaking of the ornaments of the church, we read these words,—“ I pass over many traces of ecclesiastical antiquity which occur in this book of Optatus: As, for instance, what is afterwards written in it, that the churches of Africa had very many ornaments (as he calls them) of gold and silver in the time of Maxentius. But it is still more astonishing that Optatus signifies, there were such also in the African churches, at the time they were afflicted by impious tyrants. So also Augustin says, that in the time of Dio-

* Note 159. c. xvi.

† Fol. edit. Antwerp. 1702. In this edition, p. 261 relates to a different part of his work.

“ cletian,

" cletian, and of the persecution raised by him,
 " the church of the Donatists at Cirra had two
 " golden chalices, and six of silver, and a silver
 " lamp."

Besides the above, there is no further enumeration of the ornaments of the church in this place.

Neither do I find any thing similar to what Mr. G. relates " in the edict of Diocletian and Maximian," as given us by Optatus, " respecting the subversion of churches † ;" in which, however, it is natural to expect that " the proceedings of the governors would be described."

Again, though there is a particular description of Cirra, in Numidia, given us in Optatus ‡ ; yet we do not meet with " this minute inventory," which our author specifies.

These several reasons must strongly incline one to suspect that Mr. G. never consulted the original; it is at least undeniably plain, that he did not use the edition he quotes. Have we not, therefore, a right to say, his presumption deserves censure?

• Annotationes Balduini.

P. 126, " Prætereo multa, quæ in hoc Optati libro occurrunt vestigia Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ: veluti, quod in eo scriptum deinde est, Ecclesiarum in Africa, tempore Maxentii, fuisse quamplurima (ut vocat) ornamenta ex auro et argento." — " Sed mirum magis est, quod Optatus significat talia etiam fuisse in Africanis Ecclesiis, quo tempore alioquin Ecclesia sub impiis tyrannis afflictæ jacebat. Sic et Augustinus lib. 3. contra Crescon. cap. 29. indicat, tempore Diocletiani, et persecutionis ab eo excitatæ, *Cirtensem Ecclesiam* Donatistarum habuisse calices duos aureos, et sex argenteos, et lucernam argentæam," &c.

† De Ecclesiarum Everfione, cap. ii. p. 143. 145.

‡ Histor. Carthaginensis Col' ationis, p. 344. 345.

Misrepresentations of LACTANTIUS.

Mr. G. says, "The principal eunuchs, Lucian and Dorotheus, Gorgonius and Andrew, who attended the person, possessed the favour, and governed the household, of Diocletian, protected by their powerful influence the faith which they had embraced. Their example was imitated by many of the most considerable officers of the palace, who, in their respective stations, had the care of the imperial ornaments, of the robes, of the furniture, of the jewels, and even of the private treasury; and though it might sometimes be incumbent on them to accompany the emperor when he sacrificed in the temple, they enjoyed with their wives, their children, and their slaves, the free exercise of the Christian religion."

The above passage he grounds on the sole authority of Lactantius. But it is strange that Mr. G. should appeal to this author, as his testimony makes much more against his assertion, than for it.

For Lactantius says, that "when the Christian officers, who attended the emperor at his rites of divination, had, by marking their foreheads with the sign of the cross, disturbed these rites, the chief of the Soothsayers informed Diocletian, that he could give no answer, because profane persons were present. The emperor then, being very superstitious, was highly incensed with them, and gave orders, that not only those Christians who waited on him during his religious performances, but all the other Christians who were in the palace, should offer sacrifice; and con-

* Page 564.

† "Note 133. c. xvi. Lactantius de M. P. c. 10."

"manded

*"mandated that those who refused should be beaten with stripes *."*

Now the only part of Mr. G.'s assertion, which Lactantius corroborates, is, that some of the Christians of the palace *"accompanied the emperor when he sacrificed in the temple."* Surely then this passage cannot be alleged as a proof of the favour shewn to the Christian officers: Nor can they be said to *"have enjoyed the free exercise of the Christian religion,"* when we read in Lactantius that *"they were obliged to offer sacrifices to a heathen divinity, or on refusal were so severely punished."*

What apology can be made for thus asserting, on the sole authority of Lactantius, facts which Lactantius so expressly denies?

I shall hereafter shew, how much Mr. G. is here again indebted to the learning of Dodwell, though he has spoiled the remark of that author, by his attempt to disguise it.

* "De mortibus persecutorum c. 10. Quam vero causam persequendi habuerit, exponam. Cum ageret Diocletianus in partibus orientis, ut erat pro timore scrutator rerum futurarum, immolabat pecudes, et in jecoribus eorum ventura querebat. Tum quidam ministrorum scientes Dominum, cum adlisterent immolanti, imposuerunt frontibus suis immortale signum. Quo facto fugatis demonibus sacra turbata sunt. Trepidabant aruspices, nec solitas in extis notas videbant; et quasi non litassent, sepius immolabant. Verum identidem maculatæ hostiæ nihil ostendebant, donec magister ille aruspicum tages, seu suspicione, seu visu, ait *idcirco non respondere sacra quod rebus divinis PROFANI homines intressent. Tunc ira furens, SACRIFICARE non eos tantum qui sacris ministrabant, sed UNIVERSOS qui erant in palatio, jussit, et IN EOS SI DETRACTASSENT, VERBERIBUS ANIMADVERTI.*" P. 858. edit. Spark. Oxon.

Mr. G. says, in a note where he treats of the persecution of Maximin, "These writers" (Eusebius and Lactantius) "agree in representing the arts of Maximin; but the former relates the execution of several martyrs, while the latter expressly affirms, *'occidi servos Dei vetuit +'*" (that is, *he forbade the servants of God to be slain.*)

Our historian, in this instance, makes a fresh attempt to set these two ecclesiastical writers at variance, probably hoping to overthrow, at least to invalidate the testimony of both. But it will appear that Lactantius and Eusebius "do not disagree" in their representations of the arts of Maximin, if we trust not to the "mutilated representation" of author, but consult the original passage.

For Lactantius says, "Although Maximin did indeed FORBID the Christians TO BE SLAIN, under the old pretext of Clemency;" yet, as the sentence proceeds, "he gave EXPRESS ORDERS for them to be MAIMED and TORTURED. In consequence of which, the eyes of the confessors were scooped out, their hands and feet chopped off, and their nostrils and the flaps of their ears cut through +."

I now beg the reader will particularly observe, how totally the sense of Lactantius is altered, by the artful and unfair method in which Mr. G. has quoted him. That part of the sentence which he

Pages 39, 582.

Notes 75. c. xvi. Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14. l. ix. c. 2-8.

Lactantius de M. P. c. 36.

Lactantius, de Moribus Persecutorum. c. 36.

"Nam cum clementiam SPECIE TENUS profiteretur, occidi servos Dei vetuit, DEBILITARI JUSSIT. Itaque confessoribus effodiebantur oculi, amputabantur manus, pedes destruebantur, nares vel auriculæ defecabantur." P. 892, 893. Spark. Oxon.

lays before us, is manifestly connected with the subsequent words, which, as *not being suited to his purpose*, he treacherously conceals. If the whole sentence had been transcribed by *our impartial historian*, we should then have seen that Lactantius does not *essentially* differ from Eusebius, as he expressly says that, by Maximin's command, the Christians suffered such excruciating tortures, as could not but frequently terminate in their death.

III.

There remains still a third instance of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting and perverting Lactantius, perhaps more flagrant than the last.

"There were some governors," says he, "who from a *real or affected clemency*, had preserved their hands *unstained with the blood* of the faithful," &c. To give this the air of truth, he again appeals to a passage of Lactantius; which gives a reason for this conduct of the governors; the translation of which is as follows:

"That they might have it in their power to *boast, that they had put no innocent persons to death*, for I myself have heard some boasting, that during their magistracy they had not shed innocent blood †."

Mr. G. has here again picked out a short passage from Lactantius, without laying before us the words with which it is connected, that he might support his odd fancy of being the apologist for the heathen magistrates. To prove this to the most

* Page 58;

† Note 183. c. xvi. "Ut gloriari possint nullum se innocentium peremisse, nam et ipse audiivi aliquos gloriantes, quia administratio sua, in hac parte, fuerit incruenta."
Lactant. Institut. Divin. v. 11.

inadvertent reader, I need but transcribe the whole passage from Lactantius.

“But that punishment,” says he, “is of the
 “worst kind, which is DISGUISED UNDER THE
 “FALSE APPEARANCE OF CLEMENCY; he is the
 “more SEVERE, be the more SAVAGE executioner,
 “WHO HAS RESOLVED TO KILL NO ONE: It is on
 “this account that words cannot express, what great,
 “what EXCRUCIATING KINDS OF TORTURES,
 “JUDGES of this opinion have INVENTED to accom-
 “plish their resolutions. Nor do they act in this
 “manner so much, that they may have it in their
 “power to boast, that they have slain no innocent per-
 “sons (for I myself have heard some boasting, that
 “their administration had been, in this respect, un-
 “stained with blood), but for the sake of envy;
 “lest they themselves should be overcome, or
 “the sufferers obtain the glorious reward of their
 “virtue. Therefore they think of nothing but
 “overcoming us in the punishments they invent. I
 “saw in Bithynia, a magistrate wonderfully elated
 “with joy, as if he had conquered a nation; be-
 “cause one who, for the space of two years, had
 “with great fortitude withstood his tortures, at
 “length seemed to yield. They strive, therefore, to
 “overcome us; and inflict the most exquisite pains
 “on our bodies: Yet they are only solicitous lest the
 “tortured wretches should expire. As if death alone
 “could make us happy, and not torments also;
 “which, by how much the more severe they have
 “been, are by so much the more virtuously glori-
 “ous. But they give orders, with foolish obsti-
 “nacy, that strict care be taken of the tortured, that
 “their limbs may be repaired for other racks, and
 “their blood be recruited afresh for punishment.

"What can possibly be so pious, so kind, so bene-
"mane?"

Let the humane reader for one moment reflect
what a different strain this is from the representa-
tion of our author. Who could think any one
could be so ingenious as to pervert and wrest † such a
passage as this is, to prove that "some governors;
"through a REAL or AFFECTED CLEMENCY, had pre-
"served their hands UNSTAINED WITH THE BLOOD
"of the faithful?"

* P. 451. "Illud vero pessimum genus est, cui clementia
"species falsa blanditur; illo gravior, illo severior est carnifex,
"qui neminem statuit occidere. Itaque dici non potest, hu-
"jusmodi judices, quanta et quam gravia tormentorum genera
"excogitaverint, ut ad affectum propositi sui perveniant.
"Hæc autem non tantum ideo faciunt, ut gloriari possint, nullum
"se innocentium peremisse, (nam et ipse audiivi aliquos gloriantes,
"quia administratio sua in hac parte, fuerit incruenta,) sed
"et invidiæ causa; ne aut ipsi vincantur, aut illi virtutis
"sue gloriam consequantur. Itaque in excogilandis parvarum
"generibus, nihil aliud quam victoriam excogitant. Sciunt
"enim certamen esse illud et pugnam. Vidi ego in Bithy-
"nia, præsidem gaudio mirabiliter elatum, tanquam barba-
"rorum gentem aliquam subogisset; "quod ante, qui per
"biennium magna virtute resisterat, postremo cadere visus est.
"Coniungunt igitur, ut vincant; et exquisitos dolores corporis
"bus immittunt; et nihil aliud devitant, quam ut ne torti mo-
"riantur. Quasi vero mors tantummodo beatos faciat; ac non
"etiam tormentum, quæ quanto fuerint graviora, tanto maiorem
"virtutis gloriam pariant. Illi autem pertinaci stultitia jubent;
"curam tortis diligenter adhiberi, ut ad alios cruciatus mem-
"bra renouentur, et reparetur novus sanguis ad penam.
"Quid tam pium, tam benignum, tam humanum fieri potest?
"Non curassent tam sollicitè, quos amarent. Hæc est Deo-
"rum disciplina. Ad hæc opera cultores suos erudiunt: hæc
"sacra desiderant."

† It is necessary again, particularly to point out to the
reader, that there is no full stop in Lactantius after the word
"incruenta," ("unstained with blood") to complete the sense,
as Mr. G. has unfairly represented it.

Had

Had Mr. G. asserted this as his own notion of the cruelty of the heathen magistrates, we might not have been so astonished, as he seems to put off the feelings of humanity, when he speaks of the suffering Christians. But surely the more moderate part of mankind will think there is *nothing to glory of* in sparing the life of an innocent person. And hardly the most savage barbarian could boast of *humanity*, because, after torturing a wretch to the verge of death, he would not suffer the excruciated soul, worn out with the most cruel tortures, to be released from its intolerable anguish by death, but caused the decayed spirits to be refreshed, in order to endure again the lingering agonies of the rack.

I had collected many other instances of our author's *perverting* and *misrepresenting* the testimony of the Fathers, besides those I have already produced. But the reader will perhaps rather *blame* me for having produced *so much*, than require me to produce *more evidence*. I shall therefore close this head of the Misrepresentation of the Fathers, with a passage, which the reader cannot think *misapplied to Mr. Gibbon*, as it was at first particularly aimed at *another infidel, Mr. Toland*.

"When I observe a person ransacking and mustering together all the silly trumpery of the an-

* The above proofs of the shameful usage which the primitive Christian writers have met with from Mr. G. most fully verify the complaint of their apologist *Cava*.

"Si quis in eorum libris occurrat defectus, mox arguetur et amplifcatur, si vel levissima hallucinatio exaggeratur, et in portentosum errorem provehitur; sacrum iterarum interpretationes ab iis additæ, tanquam ludicræ, infidæ: et plane *arguendissimæ* rejiciuntur; rationes et argumenta, velut *futilia, sculnea, imbecillia* exstipulantur. Quid verba multa? prae fecundis saltem, sublimibus, acutissimisque nostri temporis ingeniis à plerisque irridentur." Epistola Apologetica.

“cient heretics, grossly misrepresenting the books he
 “cites, only with design to satisfy a bigotted humour
 “against the Christian religion, I am obliged, by
 “my regards to the profession I make of the name
 “of Jesus, to lay open such vile imposture.”

As I have at great length dwelt on our author's misquotations of the Fathers, my learned reader perhaps will not be displeased, if I vary the scene, by producing two or three of his classical friends, to shew what art Mr. G. has used to suit their authority to his purpose of throwing an odium on Christianity.

Misrepresentation of DION CASSIUS.

I have already given a curious instance of our author's asserting, on the authority of Dion Cassius, a fact not mentioned by that historian; I shall now produce a very singular proof of his endeavouring to conceal from us a passage really contained in him.

Mr. G. says, “In the various compilation of
 “the Augustan history (a part of which was com-
 “posed under the reign of Constantine), there are
 “not six lines which relate to the Christians; nor
 “has the diligence of Xiphilin discovered their
 “name in the large history of Dion Cassius †.”
 This note is introduced to confirm his assertion,
 “of the careless indifference, which the most co-
 “pious and the most minute of the pagan writers,
 “have shewn to the affairs of Christianity ‡.”

It happens unluckily for our author, that this note, which he produces to support his observa-

* See the “Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament by Mr. Jeremiah Jones.”

† Note 24. c. xvi,

‡ Page 539.

tion, tends only to overthrow it: Since the truth of it must be inevitably destroyed, though *not without the justest impeachment of his veracity or learning.* For though in this place he dares to assure us, that "the diligence of Xiphilin has not discovered even the name of Christians in the large history of Dion Cassius;" yet, what is remarkably astonishing, hereafter he inconsiderately contradicts himself, by referring to a passage in Dion where the word appears*. That historian, speaking of Martia, says, "She is reported to have exerted her utmost endeavours in behalf of the CHRISTIANS; and to have benefited them greatly, as having great influence over Commodus†."

What shall we say now? Do we not discover the name of Christians in the history of Dion? With what assurance then can Mr. Gibbon, after asserting a fact manifestly untrue, lay claim to the merits of "diligence and accuracy, the indispensable duty of an historian?" Or can he expect us to credit his assertion, that "he has carefully examined all the original materials?"

With regard to what he says of the Augustan history, he cannot surely mean that *no mention is made of the Christians* in that compilation. Or would he insinuate, that there are not *six lines together, in one passage*, which respect the Christians. This is but a pitiful evasion, if intended; and if he did not mean it, he must acknowledge, that his false assertion is overthrown by the frequent notice

* Note 106. c. xvi. Dion Cassius, l. lxxii. p. 1206.

† Ἰσοριῦται δὲ αὐτῇ "πολλὰ τι ὑπὲρ τῶν ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ σπουδάζουσαι," καὶ πολλὰ αὐτοὺς ἐνθουσιάζουσαι, αὐτὴ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Κομμοδῷ πᾶν δυναμένη.

taken of them in several passages of their history, which he himself has had occasion to cite. I might particularly urge what is there related of the worship paid to Christ by the emperor Alexander Severus, recorded by Lampridius; and the law of the emperor Severus, forbidding the Christians, as well as the Jews, to make proselytes to their religion.

Misrepresentation of EPICTETUS and MARCUS ANTONINUS.

Our historian does not fairly state the words of Epictetus and Marcus Antoninus, with regard to the sentiments which the philosophers entertained of the Christians. — He says, “ The behaviour of the Christians was too remarkable to escape the notice of the ancient philosophers; but they seem to have considered it with much less admiration than astonishment. Incapable of conceiving the motives which sometimes transported the fortitude of believers beyond the bounds of prudence or reason, they treated such an eagerness to die, as the strange result of obstinate despair, of stupid insensibility, or of superstitious phrenzy†.” — In support of the above, he appeals first to a passage of Epictetus, where mention is made of the Galileans‡; but adds, “ there is some doubt whether Epictetus alludes to the Christians.” He afterwards cites the testimony of Marcus Antoninus§.

* c. xv. note 136. c. xvi. notes 110. 113, &c.

† Page 552.

‡ Note 54. c. xv. Epictetus, l. iv. c. 7.

§ Marcus Antoninus, l. xi. c. 3.

Mr. G. himself considers this observation of Epictetus as relating to the Christians*; I shall therefore proceed to shew, that the philosopher does not make their conduct the result of such motives as are here represented. For, in this chapter, "on intrepidity," he says, "those persons are capable of it who are either insensible of their danger, or involved in calamity; or those who have acquired an indifference to every thing in life." Then he adds the particular sentence alluded to by Mr. G. which I shall give in the translation of Lardner.—"Is it possible that a man may arrive at this temper, and become indifferent to those things, from *madness*, or from *habit*, as the *Galileans*? And yet that no one should be able to know, by reason and demonstration, that God made all things in the world †?"

The philosopher here accounts for the indifference of the Galileans, as if it were the effect of HABIT. He could not speak of their intrepidity as the effect

* Dr. Lardner—Testimonies, vol. ii. p. 102, 3. speaks of this passage of Epictetus, as relating to the Christians.

† Some have thought, that by Galileans, are here meant the followers of Judas of Galilee. I should rather think, that Christians are intended; of whose sufferings there are such accounts in Tacitus and Suetonius, as may assure us, that Epictetus and Arrian could not be unacquainted with them. The followers of Judas of Galilee were extinct before this time."

† Epictetus, l. iv. Arriani. (8vo edit. Cantab.) c. 7. Περὶ ἀφροσύνης.

P. 399. αὐτὸς ὅστις οὐκ ἔχει πρὸς τὴν κτήσιν ὡσαύτως ἔχει καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτο (i. e. indifferens) πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, καὶ πρὸς τὰ τέκνα, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀπὸ τίνος ματίας, καὶ ἐκ ποσότητος οὗτος ἢ διακριμμένος, ὡς ἐν μηδὲν ποιεῖσθαι τὸ ἔχειν τὰ ἅπαντα ἢ μὴ ἔχειν—ποῖός ἐστι τ. οὗτος τύραννος φοβερὸς; ἢ ποῖος δορυφόρος; ἢ ποῖος μάχαιρας αὐτῶν; ἢ τα ἡν' ὁ ΜΑΝΙΑΣ μὴ δύναται τις δύναμις διατελεῖν πρὸς ταῦτα, καὶ ἡν' ὁ ἙΘΥΣ Οἱ ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΟΙ· ὑπὸ λόγου δὲ καὶ ἀποδείξεως ὑμῶν δύναται μαθεῖν, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς πάντα πεποιήκει καὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.

of madness; for he expressly says, that it arose from *their peculiar mode of life*. I appeal to the learned reader, if Epictetus does not make a proper distinction, "Some," says he, "are intrepid through *madness*, some acquire this indifference by *custom*, as the Galilæans." Our very candid author conceals from us that any such distinction is here made; in order, no doubt, to have a pretence for giving us, on the venerable authority of the stoic, a sentiment hatched in his own infidel school, that to be a Christian and to be mad, are synonymous expressions.

Mr. G. has also quoted the authority of Marcus Antoninus on this occasion*. But he does not appear to me to have faithfully translated the phrase of that author. Causabon very accurately renders it, "*not merely through obstinacy*†." But I appeal to the learned reader, whether Mr. G. could, with any shadow of truth, give us, as the expressions of Antoninus, his strange mixture of "*obstinate despair*, stupid insensibility, or superstitious phrenzy?"

It is not indeed easy to say, what idea we can conceive of such *different affections*, as those of *obstinacy* and of *despair conjointly*: It is like our author's causing the same objects, at the same time, to "*excite*" the benevolence of "*compassion*," and the arrogance of "*contempt*‡." These pompous, but unmeaning words, which, I will suppose, Mr. G. introduced for no other reason but to round his period; his tribe of admirers, who believe every

* Marcus Antoninus, l. xi. c. 3.

μη κατὰ ψιλὴν παρὰταξιν, ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί.

† "*Non ex simplici obstinatione.*" Causabon,

§ Page 538.

thing but what is contained in the Bible; will, no doubt, adopt as the genuine expressions of the philosophic emperor.

I would observe also, the strange inconsistency of our historian on this subject.—We have just read what he says in this place; that “the behaviour of the Christians was too remarkable to escape the notice of the ancient philosophers:” He before spoke “of the supine inattention of these philosophers to Christianity”; and of their rejecting it.” He tells us also, “of the careless indifference which the most copious, and the most minute of the pagan writers, have shewn to the affairs of the Christians †.”

Yet after all, he informs us again, that “the philosophers, who now assumed the unworthy office of directing the blind zeal of persecution, had diligently studied the nature and genius of the Christian religion ‡.”

Misrepresentation of PLINY.

Our author says, “Some of these apostates had yielded on the first menace or exhortation of the magistrate; whilst the patience of others had been subdued by the length and repetition of tortures. The affrighted countenances of some betrayed their inward remorse; while others approached with confidence and alacrity to the altars of the Gods §.”

For this the first authority he quotes is Pliny’s Epistles, x. 97. But *Pliny has not particularized that difference of conduct* which Mr. G. here de-

* Page 516, 517,

† Page 530.

‡ Page 530.

§ Page 554.

|| Note 101. c. xvi,

scribes :

scribes*. Yet his name stands at the head of those authors whom he has cited on the occasion. It is allowed indeed, that this distinction is made by the other authors; but as Pliny, the first referred to by Mr. G., gives him no cause or reason to use them, it is certainly very reprehensible in our author, thus to confound their testimony, and to make a needless and improper reference.

Misrepresentation of OROSIUS †.

Our author, after speaking of the fire of Rome, says, "the vigilance of government appears not to have neglected any of the precautions, which might alleviate the sense of so dreadful a calamity. *The Imperial gardens were thrown open to the distressed multitude, temporary buildings were erected for their accommodation, and a plentiful supply of corn and provisions was distributed at a very moderate price,*" &c. And again, "But all the *prudence* and *humanity* of Nero were insufficient to preserve him from the popular suspicion, as having been the incendiary of his own capital ‡."

Not one of the several authors quoted by Mr. G. on this occasion, give him the least foundation for ascribing the virtues of *prudence* and *humanity* to the abandoned Nero §. But why Orosius should be

* I need not quote the passage from the original, as it is so well known to every admirer of the classics.

† Though this writer was a Christian priest, and a disciple of St. Austin; yet, being best known as a compiler of history, and, as such, cited by M. G. this induced me not to insert this instance of misrepresentation, amongst those of the Fathers.

‡ Page 532.

§ Impartiality requires us to inform the reader, that Mr. G. has paid that deference to the general sense of mankind, and the

he appealed to, is indeed wonderful; for, excepting the single fact of there having been such a fire, there is the most express disagreement between the circumstances related by this author, and those produced by Mr. Gibbon.

Orosius gives this dark character of Nero: "That he not only equalled, but surpassed, his uncle Caligula in every vice and crime; disgraced by petulance, lust, luxury, avarice, cruelty, and every wickedness.—He adopts the story likewise of his playing on his harp at the sad catastrophe;" and adds, "*so unbounded was his avarice that, after the fire was extinguished, he would permit no one to go to his few goods which remained; but he himself caused, whatever the flames had spared, to be carried away.*"

the authority of history, as to make the following alteration in his third edition: "But all the prudence and humanity *afforded by Nero on this occasion was insufficient to preserve him from the popular suspicion.*" (P. 637. 3d. edit.)

This correction was indeed necessary, to avoid a striking inconsistency with what immediately follows; for, otherwise, how could Mr. Gibbon call him *human* whom he admits to be "the assassin of his wife and mother?" Or how could that person "be deemed incapable of the most extravagant folly, who," as he tells us, "prostituted his person and dignity on the theatre?"

* Note 28. c. xvi. Orosius, vii. 7.

† P. 476, 471. "Gaii Caligulae avunculi fur erga omnia vitia ac scelera sectator, immo transgressor, petulantiam, libidinem, luxuriam, avaritiam, crudelitatem, nullo non scelere exercuit, &c.

"Quod" (scil. incendium Romæ) "ipse ex altissima illa Mæcenatiana torre prospectans, lætusque flammæ (ut aiebant) pulchritudine, tragico habitu illadem decanabat. Avaritiæ autem tam præceptæ extitit, ut post hoc incendium urbis, quam se Augustus ex lateritia marmoream reddidisse jactaverat, neminem ad reliquias rerum suarum adire permiserit, cuncta quæ flammæ quoquo modo superfuissent, ipse abstulit." 4to edit. Havercamp. 1738.

I now

I now appeal to the reader, if he really thinks Mr. G. would have cited Orosius, at a place where he is endeavouring to whitewash the character of Nero, if he had ever looked into that author.

Misrepresentation of BAYLE *and* FABRICIUS.

Our author says, "Notwithstanding it is probable that Tacitus was born some years before the fire of Rome, he could derive only from reading and conversation, the knowledge of an event which happened during his infancy, &c."

These words he supports by an appeal to the following authors in this note: "See the lives of Tacitus by Lipsius, and the Abbé de la Bletterie, Dictionnaire de Bayle à l'article TACITE, and Fabricius Biblioth. Latin." (tom ii. p. 386. edit. Ernest †.)

Mr. G. has here quoted four authors, as concurring to establish his assertion; whereas they vary in their sentiments. "Bayle reproves Lipsius, and his method of computing the age of Tacitus †." And Fabricius does not all treat of the time of Tacitus's birth; "but after mentioning his family and descent, proceeds to speak of the order of his work §."

It is plain, therefore, that Mr. G., with the view of displaying extensive reading, has heaped toge-

• Page 535.

† Note 36. c. xvi.

‡ "J'aurai quelques fautes à reprocher à Juste Lipsie."

"Il nous apprend qu'il a deterré à peu-près l'année natale de Tacite, &c. Bayle, tom. ii. partie ii. p. 1117. Tacite, Not. H.

§ "Cornelius Tacitus, eques Romanus, gener Cn. Julii Agricolæ, sub Vespasiano procurator Galliæ Belgicæ, &c." Fabricius, tom. ii. p. 386. edit. Ernest.

ther

ther quotations as corroborating the same fact, which, when examined, are found to differ very widely.

Misrepresentations of GROTIUS.

I.

The words of Mr. G. relative to this author are emphatical,—“The learned Grotius,” says he, “ventures to insinuate, that, FOR WISE PURPOSES, THE PIOUS DECEPTION” (namely, of the Millennium, and of the approaching end of the world) “was permitted to take place*.”

I now venture to affirm, that our author has little reason for giving us this as an *insinuation* of Grotius. Though for a good and weighty reason he has not thought proper to guide us by a reference to any particular book, chapter, or page; yet I have been able to trace *the opinion of Grotius concerning the Millennium*, which will be sufficient to convince my reader how *groundless* the words of Mr. G. are.

Grotius, in his comment on St. Luke's gospel, speaks thus on the above subject:—“And indeed
“partly from the prophecies which I have spoken
“of, partly from the prerogative of the martyrs
“in the resurrection, the opinion of the Millennium seems to have been framed, which, as received from the successors of the apostles, Justin
“and Irenæus, authors of great character, defend; who were followed by Melito, Apollinaris, Tertullian, Victorinus: *Whose opinion, though*
“*it appears to be intermixed with some human error,*
“ (since they do not all explain that felicity in the

* Note 59. c. xv.

“ same

“ (same manner) yet, perhaps, is not totally to be re-
 “ jected.”

Grotius here speaks a very different language from what Mr. G. has represented it: *He does not venture to insinuate* that this doctrine of the Millennium *was a pious deception*. What apology then can our author make, for fathering a sentiment of his own on an eminent writer, who really does not espouse it? As this is the case, we cannot surely doubt, but that the fear of detection prompted our author not to specify the passage by any particular reference.

But I may now *venture to insinuate*, in his own words, that, though his *purpose was wise*, the *deception*, which can hardly be called a *pious one*, was *not permitted to take place*.

II.

“ The fervour of the first proselytes,” says Mr. G. “ prompted them to sell those worldly possessions which they despised, to lay the price of them at the feet of the apostles, and to content themselves with receiving an equal share out of the general distribution †.”

* “ Et sane partim ex his quæ dixi vaticiniis, partim ex
 “ prærogativa martyrum in resurrectione concinnata videtur
 “ sententia illa de mille annorum felicitate, quam ut ab apo-
 “ stolorum successoribus acceptam tuerentur magis Auctores Ju-
 “ stinus et Irenæus, quos secuti sunt Melito, Apollinaris,
 “ Tertullianus, Victorinus: quorum opinio, quamquam admix-
 “ tum aliquid habere videtur humani erroris (quando nec
 “ omnes illam felicitatem pari modo explicant) forte tamen non
 “ in totum repudianda est.” Luc. cap. xxi. ver. 24. vol. ii. p.
 446.

† Page 495.

He

He confirms this, by appealing in a note* to the Acts of the Apostles, c. ii. 4, 5. with Grotius's commentary.

So far indeed the testimony, which he cites, confirms his assertion; but for the words which immediately follow in his history, he has neither the authority of Scripture, nor that of Grotius. Mr. G. thus proceeds, "when the progress of the Christian religion relaxed, and gradually abolished this generous institution, the converts who embraced the new religion were *permitted* to retain the possession of their patrimony."

The insinuation contained in the last passage is what I would particularly point out, as most opposite to the sentiment of Grotius: For though he speaks of a *general distribution* in his comment, yet he is far from asserting that there was any OBLIGATION on the first proselytes to sell their worldly possessions: and, therefore, no PERMISSIVE DISPENSATION was necessary. The translation of his words is this:

"WHILE IT REMAINED, WAS IT NOT THINE OWN? It was *not* required of thee *by us* to sell thine estate, but thou mightest have retained thy property. AND WHEN SOLD IT WAS STILL IN THY POWER. To wit, *the price*: Even after thou hadst sold thine estate, it was lawful for thee to keep the whole price, and dedicate nothing of it to God†."

This

* Note 128. c. xv.

† Act. v. 4. Οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμμεν. "Nonne manens tibi manebat."]

"Licet tibi per nos non vendere prædium, et ejus proprietatem retinere."

This sentiment is so directly the reverse of Mr. G.'s, that it must overthrow what he has said. But it is his usual crafty evasion, to cite the testimony of some great writer on a trifling and indifferent point, and then to extend it to a material reflection, which he takes care to make soon after. So, in this case, Grotius may give him authority for saying, that "the Christians who sold their possessions were content with receiving an equal share out of the general distribution:" Yet, as we have seen, he gives him not the least shadow of a pretext for making the following assertion: That, "when the progress of the Christian religion relaxed—the converts who embraced the new religion were PERMITTED to retain the possession of their patrimony."

But though Grotius does not give Mr. G. authority for his remark, it is still very consistent with his plan of accounting for the rapid progress of the gospel, by secondary causes; as *he considers the general distribution of goods, adopted by the first Christians, as "an institution which MATERIALLY conduced to the progress of Christianity."* And, "that the prospect of immediate relief, and of future protection, allured into its hospitable bosom many of those unhappy persons whom the neglect of the world would have abandoned to the miseries of want, of sickness, and of old age*."

For, if this was the case, it was certainly great policy, in them, not to PERMIT the new converts to RETAIN their possessions, but to make this general distribution, till Christianity had made some confi-

Kαὶ πρᾶξις ἐν τῇ οἱ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑμῶν;

"Et venundatum in tuā erat potestate."] "Nempe ἡ τιμὴ (pretium.) Etiam postquam vendideras fundum, pretium totum retinere tibi licebat, ac de eo nihil Deo vovere."

* Page 498.

derable

derable progress: It is in this view, I suppose, Mr. G. added the misrepresentation of Mosheim's opinion, in these words of his note:

" Mosheim in a particular dissertation attacks the common opinion, with very inconclusive arguments *."

The most common opinion, which the learned Mosheim attacks in this dissertation, is Mr. Gibbon's; namely, *that the community of goods was a chief cause of the rapid progress of CHRISTIANITY*. This opinion, common enough, indeed, among infidels, he does attack; but with arguments, which I must beg leave to call, in deference to our author's superior judgment, *very conclusive*. His words, on this occasion, are as follow †:

" What St. Luke has written of the first church of Jerusalem, *that there was no poor in it*, might be truly said of *all* the families of the primitive Christians. Since, as they were all upon an equality, and acknowledged each other as brethren; it was a *necessary consequence*, that they should suffer *no one* to be in want of those things which life requires: But that they would supply out of their abundance, in a humane and friendly manner, what some stood in need of. *This beneficence of the first Christians towards their poor*, MANY IN OUR DAYS, *who, in their own conceits, far exceed all other persons in discernment, have blemished with a suspicion of imprudence; asserting, that the Christians, by this liberality, sup-*

* Note 128. c. xv.

† As I find the same sentiment, on this subject, expressed in a concise and forcible manner in his history, which he has more copiously treated in his dissertation; I doubt not, but it will be a sufficient apology for my having adopted his words there expressed, in preference to a prolix quotation from his dissertation.

“ plied the means of idleness and pleasure: They add
 “ also, that this great care of the Christians towards
 “ the poor, should be ranked as one of THE CHIEF
 “ CAUSES of the QUICK PROPAGATION of the Chris-
 “ tian religion. For, say they, men addicted to
 “ sloth, impatient of labour, given up to pleasures,
 “ flocked in great numbers to the Christians, that
 “ they might live in a convenient and sumptuous
 “ manner, without toil and anxiety, on the offerings
 “ of the new converts. But it is astonishing, that
 “ this should be said by men who wish to appear, in
 “ the eyes of the world, as PERSONS ACQUAINTED
 “ WITH THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLES, which
 “ are extant: Which, if they had EVER read over
 “ WITH ATTENTION, they could not be ignorant, that
 “ the liberality of the Christians to their poor, was
 “ guarded by the most wise laws, lest the church
 “ should suffer any detriment, or feel the least in-
 “ convenience from it.”

He then appeals to the second epistle of St. Paul
 to the Thessalonians, c. iii. v. 6—12. and 1 Timo-
 thy, v. 3. 16. and having descanted on these pas-
 sages, mentions other regulations respecting the
 poor*.

I may

* “ Quod de principe omnium ecclesia Hierosolymitana
 “ scriptum reliquit LUCAS, ACTOR. iv. 34. nullum in ea
 “ pauperem fuisse, id de omnibus primorum Christianorum
 “ familiis verissime dicitur. Quum scilicet omnes pates sese &
 “ fratres agnoscerent, necesse erat, ut nullum in rerum, quas
 “ vita poscit hominum, penuria versari paterentur, verum ex
 “ copia sua quod deerat quibusdam amice ac humaniter
 “ suppeditarent. Eam vero veterum Christianorum erga pau-
 “ peres beneficentiam inter eos, qui sapientia supra ceteros
 “ eminere sibi videntur, multi hodie in suspitionem IMPRU-
 “ DENTIAE vocant, contententes, ignavia & voluptatis amori
 “ liberalitate sua Christianos fomenta subjecisse: cui addunt, IN
 “ CAUSIS TAM CELERITER PROPAGATAE religionis Christia-
 “ nae hoc ipsum pauperum studium PRIMO LOCO collocari debere :
 “ homines

I may therefore, surely, with great reason, appeal to every candid reader, whether the *only common opinion* attacked here by Mosheim, is not that espoused by Mr. G.—But, indeed, it suited our author's purpose, to represent Mosheim's arguments as *inconclusive*; as he must be conscious, that a fair view of them would have exposed his own false assertion.

I shall now proceed to shew how small, and how trifling, the authority is, which our author really has for his very important remarks on the doctrine of “the condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous among the Pagans” I have already shewn, that the testimony of Tertullian, the only

“homines enim inertes, laboris impatientes, voluptarios, magno numero ad Christianos accurrisse, quo cum suis laute, commode, sine labore & curâ, ex novorum fratrum muneribus vivere possent. Mirum vero huic dici a viris, qui apostolorum, quæ extant, scripta evoluisse videri volunt. Quæ si attente legisset, non ignoraret, liberalitatem Christianorum in pauperes sapientissimis legibus septam fuisse, ne quid inde incommodi & detrimendi redundaret in ecclesiam. Primum disertissima PAULI lege numero pauperum excludebantur omnes, qui victum sibi met ipsi, quam possent, querere, & laborare nolebant: nec pauperum tantum numero, verum etiam fratrum excludebantur. Omnes item, qui secus vivebant, quam decebat CHRISTI discipulos, suas sibi res habere jubebantur & Christianæ caritatis fructu carere. 2 Thess. iii 6.—12. —Alia lege, æque clara & diserta, singulis Christianorum familiis officium imponebatur pauperes suos alendi, nec permittendi, ut ecclesiæ oneri essent. 1 Tim. v. 3. 16.—Altera lege cavebatur, ne mali homines beneficia ecclesiæ in vitiorum alimenta converterent: altera providebatur, ne publicorum pauperum numerus præter modum cresceret & oculos piorum nimis gravaret. Igitur non omnis, cui aut nulla res erat, aut angusta, pauperis nomine venerando honestabatur in prisca ecclesia; verum pauper erat vir Dei, hominumque amans, qui nec sua sibi victum industria comparare, nec a necessariis & cognatis opem sperare poterat.” Hist. Christian. sæc. i. p. 142. § 45.

Father he quotes, does not tend to corroborate his assertion: My next step is to examine what he adds besides on this subject. " And yet whatever may
 " be the language of individuals, it is still the public doctrine of all the Christian churches. The
 " Jansenists, who have so diligently studied the works of the Fathers, maintain this sentiment
 " with a distinguished zeal; and the learned M. de Tillemont never dismisses a virtuous emperor without pronouncing his damnation.
 " Zuinglius is the only leader of a party who has ever adopted the milder sentiment, and he gave
 " no less offence to the Lutherans than to the Catholics *."

It is here evident, at first sight, that testimony is produced only for a small part of this *very material note*. The sentiment of Zuinglius is all that we find in Bossuet, at the place referred to. He is here spoken of " as a bold man, of more fire
 " than judgment;" and though " no one of the reformers explained their thoughts in a manner
 " more precise and uniform; yet, at the same time, no one carried them to so great a height,
 " nor with more boldness," than Zuinglius. To prove this, Bossuet instances his " admitting into
 " heaven, even the heroes and demi-gods of the Pagan mythology." On which he well observes, that " such notions as these are not to be considered
 " as those flights of imagination which escape men in the heat of argument: For Zuinglius was
 " writing a confession of the faith; and a plain and precise explanation of the Apostles' creed:
 " A work, the nature of which requires, above all

* Note 68. c. xv. Bossuet Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, l. ii. c. 19. — 2.

" others, a mature consideration, exact doctrine, and settled meaning *."

The above passage may give some reason for the offence which this doctrine of Zuinglius occasioned. However, I must particularly observe, that no authority is cited to confirm the former *and most material part* of the note, that *this is still the public doctrine of ALL the Christian churches*. Indeed it would have been a hard task for our author to have obtained testimony for the bold assertion. For with the author of the remarks, I dare to say, as a member of the church of England, that *she holds no such doctrine*. We do not presume to set limits to the mercy of God. The light of nature being their guide; by that test, the Scripture informs us, they will be rewarded or condemned—" For as many

* " Zuingle Pasteur de Zurich avoit commencé à troubler l'Eglise, à l'occasion des indulgences, aussi-bien que Luther, mais quelques années après. C'estoit un homme hardi, & qui avoit plus de feu que de sçavoir. Il y avoit beaucoup de netteté dans son discours, & aucun des Prétendeurs Réformateurs n'a expliqué ses pensées d'une manière plus précise, plus uniforme, & plus suivie : mais aussi aucun ne les a poussées plus loin, ni avec plus de hardiesse. Comme on connoitra mieux le caractère de son esprit par ses sentimens que par mes paroles, je rapporteray un endroit du plus accompli de tous ses ouvrages."

" C'est la Confession de Foy, qu'il adressa un peu devant sa mort à François I. Là, expliquant l'article de la vie éternelle, il dit à ce Prince, qu'il doit espérer de voir l'assemblée de tout ce qu'il y a eû d'hommes saints, courageux, fideles, & vertueux dès le commencement du monde," &c.

" Vous y verrez Hercule, Thésée, Socrate, Aristide, Antigonus, Numa, Camille, les Catons, les Scipions," &c.

" Ce n'estoit pas icy de ces traits qui échappent aux hommes dans la chaleur du discours : il écrivoit une Confession de Foy, il vouloit faire une explication simple & précise du Symbole des Apotres ; ouvrage d'une nature à demander plus que tous les autres une meûre considération, une doctrine exacte, & un sens raffiné." Bossuet Histoire des Variations, &c. l. ii. c. 19—22. p. 25. &c. 8vo, edit. à Liege.

“ as have sinned without law, shall also perish
 “ without law : And as many as have sinned in
 “ the law, shall be judged by the law *.”

Misrepresentation of IGNATIUS.

Our author throws out a false accusation against this Father, in the following words:

“ It was impossible,” says he, “ that the Gnostics
 “ could receive our present gospels, many parts of
 “ which (particularly in the resurrection of Christ)
 “ are directly, and, as it might seem, designedly,
 “ pointed against their favourite tenets. It is
 “ therefore somewhat singular, that † Ignatius
 “ should chuse to employ a vague and doubtful
 “ tradition, instead of quoting the certain testimo-
 “ ny of the evangelists ‡.”

I cannot find any passage, that bears the least similarity to what Mr. G. observes, in the whole epistle, which I have read over more than once. Ignatius advises, on the contrary, “ *to pay parti-*
 “ *cular attention to the prophets, but more ESPECIAL-*
 “ *LY to the GOSPEL*, in which the passion, of our
 “ Lord is made manifest unto us, and his resur-
 “ rection perfectly demonstrated §.”

* St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, ii. 12. See Whitby, Hammond, Locke, Taylor, &c. See also Bishop Sherlock's Discourse, I. vol. i.

† Epist. ad Smyrn. Patr. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 34.

‡ Note 34. c. xv.

§ Ignatius Epist. ad Smyrnæos.

Προσίχων δὲ τοῖς προφῆταις, ἰσχυρίσας δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῶν διδύλωται, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τιθεμένηται. p. 4.^α

Sect. V. Ὅτι τινες ἀγνοοῦντες ἀρεσκύνται, μᾶλλον δὲ κηρύττειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτις συνήγοροι τοῦ θανάτου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας. οὗς οὐκ ἔπιπσαι αἱ προφητίαι, οὐδ' ὁ νόμος Μωσίου, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μίχρη τῶν Τῶ ἘΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, οὐδὲ τὰ ἡμῖν γε τῶν κατ' ἡμῶν παθόντων. P. 44. edit, Ruffel.

Again,

Again, he says, " There are some who, being ignorant of Jesus Christ, deny him, or rather have been denied by him, being advocates of his death, rather than of the truth—whom neither the prophecies, nor the law of Moses, nor even the gospel have persuaded, to this time *."

Now with what truth can Ignatius be said to employ a *vague and doubtful tradition*, when he founds the truth of our Saviour's passion and resurrection, on the authority of the prophets and the evangelists? May we not then naturally conclude, that if our author had ever looked into this epistle of the Father, which he cites with a parade of learning, he could not have been guilty of so gross a misrepresentation?

Misrepresentation of LE CLERC and MOSHEIM.

I have already given one proof of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting Le Clerc, in treating of the Jewish opinion concerning a future state. I now proceed to another instance of his unfairly stating the opinion of this writer with regard to the epistles of Ignatius.

* I have here adopted the interpretation of the original word *τιμωμαι*, which the learned Beaufobre has given. His explication of the whole passage, and his defence of this Father from the misrepresentation of Mr. Simon, is truly ingenious. It will be hereafter shewn, that a part of this explication probably gave rise to the remark of Mr. G.; but had he fairly represented the whole of it, it would have appeared that St. Ignatius himself complains of those persons who were so particularly fond of *vague and doubtful tradition*, as not to receive the scripture itself without its authority. It must be owned, our historian is *very expert in misrepresentation*. See Beaufobre. Hist. de Maniché, &c. tome i. partie ii. livre ii. ch. vii. § 8. p. 450, &c. 4to edit.

His

His words are, " Ignatius* is fond of exalting
 " the episcopal dignity. *Le Clerc* † *very bluntly*
 " *censures his conduct.*"

I shall first observe Mr. G.'s inaccuracy, in referring to chapter iii. of Ignatius's epistle to the Smyrneans, for this subject; whereas he should have appealed to chap. viii. and ix. to which particular chapters *Le Clerc* himself refers, and indeed he is so far from *bluntly censuring his conduct*, that he, on the contrary, is really his advocate; as will plainly appear from these his words:

" Although in the former epistles, except that
 " to the Romans, Ignatius exhorts the Christians
 " to obey the governors of the church, yet on no
 " occasion does he speak of it so earnestly as in this
 " epistle to the Smyrneans."

Le Clerc then quotes the passage, and makes the following observations on it.

" Ignatius was acquainted with the sound doctrine and holy manners of Polycarp, by whom
 " nothing could be said, or done, which was not
 " consonant to the Gospel. If he had been guilty
 " of teaching unsound doctrine or of corrupt
 " morals, or suspected of inconstancy, the bishop
 " of Antioch would never have used such
 " language. After it was found from experience
 " that the Christian bishops, as in the time of Arius,
 " Nestorius, or Eutyches, had deviated from the
 " Gospel both with regard to doctrine and practice,
 " no doubt they, who differed from them in
 " opinion, did not think it was their duty to obey
 " them in all things. *These* (injunctions) therefore
 " *are not to be looked upon*, says *Le Clerc*, *as mathematical axioms, which admit of no exception:*

* Note III. c. xv. Ignatius ad Smyrnaeos, c. 3, &c.

† Hist. Ecclesiast. p. 569.

" And

“ And we may say the same of the other precepts
 “ of Ignatius, which relate to the honour due to
 “ truly Christian bishops *.”

This certainly does not appear like *blunt censure*, but rather friendly construction, and apology; for he first gives the reasons why Ignatius should use this language, and then puts in a necessary restraint, shewing how these precepts were, and should be respected; namely, *as general rules, but not without exception.*

By the above interpretation, an agreement is formed between this and a previous apology, which Le Clerc makes for Ignatius.

• “ Quamvis in superioribus Epistolis, exceptâ eâ quæ ad
 “ Romanos data est, Ignatius Christianos ad obsequium erga
 “ Rectores Ecclesiæ hortetur; in nulla tam graviter ea de
 “ re agit, quàm in hac ad Smyrnæos epistola, ubi sic c. viii. lo-
 “ quitur, “ Omnes episcopum sequimini, ut Jesus Christus Pa-
 “ trem, & Presbyterium, ut Apostolos. Diaconos autem re-
 “ vereamini, ut Dei mandatum” (hoc est, “ Apostolorum ac
 “ proinde Dei mandato institutos”) “ Sine Episcopo nemo
 “ quidquam eorum, quæ ad Ecclesiam pertinent, faciat. Fir-
 “ ma Eucharistia ea habeatur, quæ sub episcopo fuerit, vel
 “ quam ipse permiserit. Ubi comparuerit Episcopus, ibi mu-
 “ tando sit: quemadmodum ubi fuerit Jesus Christus, ibi est
 “ Catholica Ecclesia. Nec baptizare, neque agapam cele-
 “ brare, sine Episcopo licet: sed quicquid ille probaverit,
 “ Deo gratum est, ut tutum ratumque sit quicquid agitur.”

“ Norat, nempe Polycarpi sanam doctrinam & sanctos mo-
 “ res; à quo nihil doceri, aut fieri poterat, quod non esset
 “ Evangelio consentaneum. Si fuisset praviæ doctrinæ, aut
 “ morum minus castigatum reus, aut inconstantiz suspectus,
 “ nunquam ita loquutus esset episcopus Antiochenus. Certè
 “ postquam Christiani Episcopi, ut temporibus Arii, Nestorii,
 “ aut Eutychis, nec doctrinam Evangelicam, nec mores ei
 “ consentaneos retinuisse compertum est; iis per omnia obse-
 “ qui oportere qui aliter sentiebant, non crediderunt. Non
 “ sunt ergo hæc instar axiomaticum Mathematicorum, quæ nul-
 “ là exceptione laborent, habenda: uti nec sequentia quæ ad
 “ verè Christianorum Episcoporum honorem pertinent.”

Hist. Ecclesiast. Sæculum ii. Ann. cxvi. § 29.

“ I am

"I am surprised," says he, "that this should appear to learned men as difficult to be credited; and, therefore, that the epistles of Ignatius are to be rejected." "What if Irenæus, Epiphanius, and others, should not have mentioned such men as these, it does not therefore follow that there were none, since these writers themselves are not so very accurate as to make no omissions*."

This must be allowed to be an apology even stronger than the former: Therefore Mr. G.'s expression that Le Clerc *blantly censures* Ignatius, has no other foundation than in his own fancy.

But the MISREPRESENTATION OF MOSHEIM'S opinion on these epistles is still more flagrant. "Mosheim, with a more critical judgment," says he, "suspects the purity even of the smaller epistles" of Ignatius †.

The real case is, Mosheim, at the place cited by Mr. G., tells us, "he knows not which are genuine, but speaks of some of the epistles as having an undoubted claim to veracity." His suspecting the purity, even of the smaller epistles, according to Mr. G., seems to imply a total rejection of the larger. Mosheim's words are expressly the reverse, that "the longer epistles are of greater value: this opinion may be objected to," adds he, "but can never be confuted."

* § 28. "Quare miror hoc viris doctis * difficile creditu visum; propterea que Ignatianus Epistolas esse rejectas. Quod si Irenæus, Epiphanius, alique non meminerint ejusmodi hominum, non sequitur propterea nullos fuisse; cum non usque ad id adcurati illi scriptores sint, ut nihil omittant." See also p. 571. § 31.

† Note 111. c. xv.

* Difficile creditu] Vide Cotelierium ad hunc locum, &c. Pearsonum Virid. Ignat. P. 2. c. ix.

Again,

Again, he says, " Whatever edition we prefer, we shall never be able to remove every corruption and interpolation. In his opinion, therefore, the contest respecting these epistles is not, nor can be determined till other copies be found to throw more light on the subject. That *these epistles are very ancient, it is most certain*," continues Mosheim, " *and that the whole of them are not forged, is so credible that nothing can be more so* : But how far they ought to be received as genuine, I think is totally inexplicable*."

To prove that it was the constant sentiment of the learned and judicious Mosheim, that the epistles of Ignatius were *not to be rejected*, and that *some of them were genuine* ; I shall subjoin this further proof, which he gives in the first volume of his dissertations.

" He desires to know the reasons, for which his opponent deemed the epistles of *Ignatius* to be spurious and forged. That it materially concerned him, as he had lately made use of the *authority of these epistles in writing against To-*

* " Ipsa vero quam cum aliis viris doctis communem habent, sententia, longiores epistolas *IGNATII* majoris aestimandas esse quam breviores, oppugnari quidem, verum omni veri specie nudari & funditus everti, nullo modo potest."

" Utram vero editionem præstare alteri ducamus, tanquam tamen, quicquid etiam conemur, omnem ab his epistolis depravationis & interpolationis suspicionem prorsus amovimus. Meo igitur judicio magna illa lis de Ignatianis epistolis, quæ tot viros egregios exercuit, adhuc sub iudice versatur, neque dirimi poterit, nisi vel plures & antiquiores codices reperiantur, vel alia veterum scriptorum monumenta, quæ lucem disputantibus clariorem præbeant, proterantur. Antiquissimas esse has epistolas, certissimum est : non totas esse confictas, tam credibile, ut nihil credibilius fieri possit : quatenus vero pro sinceris haberi debeant, id inenodabile arbitror."

De rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. p. 161.

" land :

land : And had then, after an accurate examination, found *no reason to decline making use of them* ; thinking the arguments of *Pearson*, and others, in favour of them, *unanswerable*. Wherefore, says he, if you have any thing which will overthrow their authority, do not refuse to communicate it : And if I perceive your arguments to be well grounded, I will expunge every thing I said to *corroborate their authority* in my former work *."

We find him also, in a subsequent dissertation, giving it as his judgment, that " the epistles of Ignatius are of the highest antiquity, as they con-

* " Video ex Dissertatione Tua " *de columba ex POLYCARPI rogo evolante*" omnes IGNATII & POLYCARPI epistolae spurias & confictas esse, TE persuasissimum habere. Acta etiam POLYCARPI omnino a TE rejiciuntur. E re mea est, ut cognoscam, quibus rationibus in hanc inductus sis opinionem. Nuper cum adversus celeberrimum TOLANDUM antiquae Christianorum disciplinae vindicias conscriberem, etiam has in auxilium vocavi epistolas, magnamque demonstrationis partem ope earum contexui. Serio in falsitatem & veritatem earum inquirenti nihil tum occurrebat, quod me a proposito iis utendi dimoveret. PEARSONI potius, aliorumque rationes invictas esse opinabar. Sed homines sumus, qui non raro fallimur. Facilius quidem quare aliquid falsum, quam quare verum cernimus ; sed & interdum, quum res nostra agitur, nimis celeriter, quare aliquid verum sit, perspicimus. Quamobrem, VIR AMPLISSIME, si quid habes, quod auctoritatem harum epistolarum evertere possit, invidere nobis noli. Omnium interest ut ex illis tandem fluctibus emergamus, quantive hae epistolae habendae sint, cognoscamus. Ego quidem, si rationes TUAS immotas esse conspexero, laetus mentem veterem exuam, omniaque quae in vindiciis meis chartis illis innituntur, expungam. Permanebit veritas, etiam si haec cadant. Quod si vero labefactari eas haud posse post institutam deliberationem intellixero, adversarium me, sed modestum & pacificum, habebis."

Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentium, vol. i. De Joanne in fervens oleum conjecto, p. 530, &c. 8vo edit.

" tain

"tain traces of that ancient simplicity not to be found in later writers *."

Nay, we are sure, that he never saw reason to change this opinion. For, when at a more advanced period of his life, he published an edition of his dissertations, with his last corrections, he expressly tells us :

"Whatever I advanced in my dissertation on St. John's being cast into the burning cauldron of oil, however juvenile my judgment was, which age has now improved, *I mean to confirm; as I have intentionally made no alterations in it.* Neither do I now perceive, that *I made any mistake, nor do I reject any thing at present, which I then embraced* †." And yet this was the dissertation in which Mosheim gave judgment in favour of the epistles of Ignatius. Surely now, after all this accumulation of evidence, Mr. G. will be more cautious than to say that Mosheim, with a critical judgment, suspects their purity.

Misrepresentation of LE CLERC and MOSHEIM.

There still remains another instance of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting both these authors, as well as Cyprian, on the same subject.

* "Atque vel hanc propter causam vetustissimas esse judico IGNATII epistolas, quoniam antiquæ hujus simplicitatis rariora in sequentibus scriptoribus vestigia reperio." Dissertatio, "De Gallorum Appellationibus," § xi. p. 600.

† "*Integram & hanc, & precedentem de Johanne in fervens oleum conjecto* Commentatiunculam reddere consulto lectoribus volui, ut quali juvenis fuerim ingenio & quatenus me sapientiore, melioremque ætas fecerit, *statueri valeant.* In univ. nihil à me peccatum esse, nunc etiam sentio, nec quæ olim judicavi, hodie repudio."

Addenda ad primum volumen Dissertationum, &c. p. 767.

"The

"The bishops of Italy, and of the provinces," says he, "were disposed to allow them," (that is, the Roman pontiffs) "a supremacy of order and association (such was their very accurate expression) in the Christian aristocracy *."

He then appeals by note to the following writers. Irenæus adv. Hæres. iii. 3. Tertullian de Præscriptione, c. 26. and Cyprian. Epistol. 27. 55. 71. 75." To which he adds this remark, "Le Clerc (Hist. Eccles. p. 764.) and Mosheim (p. 258. 578.) labour in the interpretation of these passages. But the loose and rhetorical style of the Fathers often appears favourable to the pretensions of Rome †."

The expression which our author here adopts, that "Le Clerc and Mosheim labour in the interpretation of these passages," seems to imply, that it is with great difficulty they can maintain their point. With how little foundation Mr. G. has said this, will appear from the following just representation; and it will prove, that *the loose and rhetorical style of the Fathers does not so often appear favourable to the pretensions of Rome.*

It is remarkable, that neither Le Clerc nor Mosheim do at all appeal to the authority of Cyprian, as we should imagine they did from Mr. G.'s words, "they labour in the interpretation of these passages;" by which, I suppose, he means *those passages he had just cited*, among which *the greater number* are from Cyprian. But as neither Le Clerc nor Mosheim have cited these passages of Cyprian, let us see what reason Mr. G. had for quoting them.

* Page 494.

† Note 122, c. xv.

He first appeals to epistle 27. which (in the Oxford edition, Fell. *) is addressed to "The presbyters and deacons of Rome, whom Cyprian only consults, asking their assistance against Lucian."

Pamelius' edition, epist. 27. † speaks indeed of the dignity of bishops in general, and so may be interpreted of the see of Rome in particular, by a person that way inclined. Yet the note says otherwise: "So far was Cyprian from intending these words to be understood of the prerogatives of the Roman church; that from hence he grounds and asserts his own rights, and those of all the other bishops ‡."

However it must not be denied, that some passages in epist. 55, &c. do indeed seem to intimate a supremacy.

Yet, in epistle 71, we find Cyprian arguing against it, "For," says he, "Peter himself, whom the Lord first made choice of, and upon whom he built his church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him respecting circumcision, did not insolently claim, or arrogantly assume, any thing to himself, by saying, that he held a supremacy, and ought to be obeyed by younger and succeeding bishops §."

* Mr. G. has specified this particular edition; he ought therefore, for conformity, to adhere to it, at least to inform us when he makes use of another edition.

† Epist. 33. edit. Oxon. Fell.

‡ "Tantum abest ut verba hæc senserit Cyprianus de ecclesiæ Romanæ prærogativis fuisse intelligenda; ut exinde sua et aliorum omnium episcoporum jura stabiliat atque offerat."

§ "Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum discreparet, vindicavit sibi aliquid intoleranter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere; et obtemperari à novellis et posteris, sibi potius oportere."

Page 194.

We may therefore conclude, that the passages of Cyprian, to which our author refers us, do not appear favourable to the pretensions of Rome.

The sentiment of the learned Dodwell deserves attention, as he has written many judicious dissertations on the epistles of Cyprian.

He says, " It was impossible that Cyprian could ever have allowed a supremacy; because that very argument which he insists on, and constantly repeats, that every bishop was supreme in his own diocese, was totally inconsistent with the principle of their acknowledging one as the center of union: So that neither the opinion nor the reasoning of Cyprian, is so favourable to the Romanists as they imagine*."

I come now to the arguments of *Le Clerc* †. " There are some who think it manifest," says he, " from

* " Quid quod absoluta illa episcoporum in sua cujuscunque diocesi supremas toties à Cypriano, inter æstus etiam disputandi, non agnita modo sed asserta etiam atque inculcata non patitur ut eundem existimemus unum aliquem inter illos agnovisse unitatis principium, à quo utique qui ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitatem illibatam vellent, pendere omnino, et decreta ejus agnoscere debuerint. Ita nec sententiam habebimus Cypriani, nec ratiocinationem, ita, quam existimant, Romanensibus propriam." Dodwell. Dissert. Cyprian, p. 175, 176.

† *Le Clerc*. Hist. Ecclesiæ. Ann. CLXXX.

Secl. 13. p. 763. " Sunt qui velint ex *Irenæo* constare non aliter sensisse veteres de ecclesiâ, quàm nunc vulgè sentiunt pontificii Romanæque ecclesiæ, è veterum sententiâ, *primatum*, ut loquuntur, debitum fuisse; ita ut auctoritate eâ polleret, quæ nulli alii inerat ecclesiæ. At veteribus hæreticis, qui scripturæ et apostolorum auctoritatem nihili faciebant, j. re opponi poterat consensus ecclesiarum Christianarum, ab apostolis olim condinarum. Verum, non eadem est ratio eorum, qui à ducentis propè annis ab ecclesiâ Romana secesserunt; cum scripturæ et apostolorum auctoritatem fidei suæ unicū fundamentum esse statuunt; nec secessionem fecerint, nisi quia fundamentum illud, quod immotum esse oportuit, labefactum

" ab

" from *Irenæus*, that the fathers were of the same
 " opinion as the present Papists, that a *primacy* is
 " due to the church of Rome; so that it enjoys an
 " authority that is inherent in no other church.
 " But though the consent of the Christian churches,
 " founded long since by the apostles, could be
 " justly

" ab iis, quibus valedixerunt, putabant. Itaque arma quibus
 " utitur *Irenæus* contra veteres hæreticos, in eos, qui hodie dis-
 " sentiunt ab ecclesia Romana, moveri non possunt.

14. " Audiamus verò *Irenæum*. de Romana ecclesia loquen-
 " tem, prout ejus verba ab interprete barbaro (nam desunt hic
 " prioras Græcæ) conversa sunt.

" Quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium ec-
 " clesiarum numerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ, et
 " omnibus cognitæ, à gloriosissimis duobus apostolis, Petro et Paulo,
 " Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam, quam habet ab apo-
 " stolis traditionem et adnunciatam hominibus fidem, per successi-
 " ones episcoporum, pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confun-
 " dimus omnes eos, qui quoque modo, vel per sibi placentiam, vel
 " vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præ-
 " terquam oportet, colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter
 " potiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam;
 " hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles; in quâ semper ab iis, qui
 " sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ ab apostolis traditio.

" In hoc verò loco, plura interpretatione indigent; itaque me-
 " minerimus, oportet, I. Romanam ecclesiam fuisse maximam, an-
 " tiquissimam et notissimam ecclesiarum tantum Occidentalium;
 " omnes enim Asiæ ecclesiæ, quæ annum LXI. quo Romam pri-
 " mum venit Paulus, conditæ fuerant, et præsertim quidem Ie-
 " rosolimitana, et Antiochena, Romanæ antiquiores erant, nec
 " initio minore credentium numero abundabant; ac proinde si
 " ratio tantum antiquitatis habenda fuit, eas ecclesias Romanæ
 " fuisse præponendas; sed dixi *Irenæum* de Occidentalibus ec-
 " clesiis loqui videri:—II. confundi in Occidente meritò potuisse
 " homines, qui, repudiatis apostolorum scriptis, novam doctri-
 " nam veluti ore à nescio quibus discipulis Christi aut apostolo-
 " rum acceptam; cum iis opponeretur ecclesiæ Romanæ traditio,
 " quæ minimùm tam erat fide digna, quàm obscuri nescio cujus
 " hominis accepta ab iis, ut siebant, doctrina:—III. Alioqui
 " successionis, inter ipsos recte sentientes Christianos, rationem
 " tantam habitam non esse, quasi sola esset veritatis argumentum;
 " quod videre licuit in controversia de Paschate, in qua successi-
 " onis Romanæ traditio neque ab Asiaticis ecclesiis, neque ab
 " ipso *Irenæo* audita est.—IV. Pro vocibus *per sibi placentia*, ut

" justly opposed to the ancient heretics, who paid
 " no regard to scriptural and apostolic authority ;
 " yet the same argument does not hold good
 " against those Christians who separated from the
 " Roman church near two hundred years ago, be-
 " cause they fixed on scriptural and apostolic au-

" habet Codex, quem sequuta est Parisiensis editio, alios ha-
 " bere (*) *per sibi placentiam*, hoc est, *ad rē audidū*, quod
 " fortè melius est.—V. *Potiorē principalitatem* videri, ut dixi-
 " mus in (†) notis ad ann. CLXXXIII. 2. esse pro Græcis
 " *ἡγεμονία ἀρχαιότητα*; *potiorē antiquitatem*, idque confirmari
 " elogio ecclesiæ Romanæ; quæ *antiquissima* ab *Irenæo* dicitur;
 " nimirum ut monuimus in Occidente:—VI. Quod additur *ad*
 " *hanc* *neceſſe est omnium convenire ecclesiam*, videri perinde esse
 " ac, si qua nasceretur controversia, consulendam fuisse (‡), non
 " quasi aliorum Christianorum fidei dominam, sed ut ejus confi-
 " lium audiretur, conferreturque cum omnium sententiis; quod
 " contigit in controversia de Paschate, in qua tamen omnibus
 " ecclesiis tam sequi necesse non fuit:—VII. *Qui sunt undique fi-*
 " *deles*, esse totius terrarum orbis Christianos, qui vocantur in
 " sequentibus *qui sunt undique*; dicunturque in omni ecclesiâ,
 " *conſervasse eam*, quæ est *ab apostolis, traditum*:—VIII. Si
 " quid sit minus accuratum, in *Irenæi* rationatione, memores
 " nos esse oportere, patrum argumentationes non esse demon-
 " strationes mathematicas, quæ semper et per omnia, hæc ex-
 " ceptione ullâ, sunt veræ, sed satis esse aliquo sensu esse veras,
 " quod et in omnium scriptorum interpretatione observandum
 " norunt critici."

(*) Note 19. *Per sibi placentiam*.] Sic barbare vertit interpres vocem
 Græcam adlatam, ex etymologia, ut solet; nam *ἀυσιδν* est *αυρι*; *αυρι* *αδν*,
 sibi ipse placens, uno verbo *αυσιδν*. Vide Hesychium, Suidam, et Etymologicum magnum.

(†) The note referred to is p. 742. Note 3. *Majorem antiquitatem*. " Cre-
 " diderim *Irenæum* dimisse *ἡγεμονίαν*, aut *ἡγεμονία ἀρχαιότητα*, nam *principalem*
 " vertit aliquoties interpres *ἡγεμονίαν*, unde sequitur, ut *ἡγεμονία*, verteret
 " *principalitatem*; quia ex Etymologia significata interpretatur passim."

(‡) Note 21. " *Consulendam fuisse*.] Quidam volunt dici Roman ivisse Chris-
 " tianos, negotiorum causâ, quia sedes erat imperii, inter quos *Grægius*. Sed
 " eam sententiam bene consultavit *Franc. Fenardentius*, ivisse enim dicuntur
 " *ad ecclesiam*, non ad Cæsarem; agiturque hæc de ecclesiæ Romanæ dignitate
 " et auctoritate, quæ fiebat, ut non inviti ei assentirentur Christiani, in re-
 " bus dubiis, quamvis non tolerent ab eâ jura veluti petere, eique cæco ad-
 " sensu parere, ut liquet ex controversia hæc memorata.

" thority

" authority is the only foundation of their faith ;
 " nor would they have separated, if they had not
 " thought that the foundation which ought to be
 " immovable, had been shaken by those whom
 " they left. The weapons, therefore, which Ire-
 " næus uses against the ancient heretics, cannot be
 " wielded against those who at present dissent from
 " the church of Rome.

He then makes several remarks on the passage in
Irenæus, which I have abridged as much as possi-

Having previously noted, that " we have not
 " the original Greek, but only the *translation* of a
 " rude interpreter," he remarks the *obscurity* of
 the passage : And that " the Roman church was
 " the greatest, most ancient, and celebrated of the
 " western churches *only* ; for all the Asiatic
 " churches, especially those of *Jerusalem* and *An-
 " tioch*, were planted before St. Paul first came to
 " Rome ; and therefore, with respect to *antiquity*,
 " claimed a *preference*."

" That the orthodox Christians themselves
 " did not look on this argument of succession as
 " *infallible* ; which is manifest in the controversy
 " respecting *Easter*, in which the tradition of the
 " Roman succession was *not* heard by the Asiatic
 " churches, nor by *Irenæus* himself."

That the original Greek words, which are tran-
 slated *more desirable principality*, might perhaps
 mean only *more excellent antiquity*, " which agrees
 " with the eulogium of Irenæus on the church of
 " Rome, that it was *the most ancient*."

" That what Irenæus adds, " *it is necessary for
 " every church to repair to this*," appears to me a
 " that when a controversy arose, it was to be con-
 " sulted, not as the *mistress of the faith of other Chris-
 " tians* ; but that its sentiment might be heard and

" compared with the opinions of all the rest.
 " This was the case in the controversy about
 " Easter, in which, notwithstanding, it was not
 " necessary for the other churches to follow her
 " sentiment. Lastly, if there are any inaccuracies
 " in the reasoning of *Irenæus*, we should remember
 " that the reasonings of the Fathers are not ma-
 " thematical demonstrations, which are every
 " where, and always true, without any exception,
 " but that it is sufficient that they are *true in some*
 " *sense*; which rule critics know should be observed
 " in the interpretation of all authors."

In a note on this passage he justly observes, that
 " perhaps the ignorant interpreter did not rightly
 " understand the meaning of *Irenæus*. Perhaps,"
 says he, " it is a fault of a greater kind, a *wrong*
 " *corruption*, so that we read in *Irenæus* more than
 " he himself ever wrote."

It must then certainly be allowed, that this diffi-
 cult and obscure passage, when cleared up and il-
 lustrated, is not *favourable to the pretensions of Rome*.
 And no ingenuous person would construe the skill
 of the critic into a *laboured interpretation*.

The interpretation of this passage of *Irenæus*, by
 Mosheim, is indeed diffuse and minute; but it is
 by no means *wrested or laboured*.

Our learned advocate Mosheim, after speaking
 of the *equality* of the primitive churches, adds,
 that a *preference* was afterwards given to the judg-

* Note 22. "*Quod et in omnibus.*" Vide hac de re artis cri-
 " tice postremam ed. p. ii. lib. i. cap. iv. 15, & seqq. Ce-
 " terum optandum esset locum hunc *Irenæi* Græcè extare, nam
 " barbarus interpres mentem ejus fortè non satis eni adsequutus,
 " et fortè etiam librarii in versione ejus exhibenda peccarunt;
 " nisi sit hic peccatum *majoris abollæ* ut ille loquitur, quo
 " factum sit ut legatur in *Irenæo*, quod in eo scriptum non sit."

ment of the churches *founded by the apostles**. In his note he copiously examines the *vain* pretensions of the church of Rome to a *supremacy*, from the authority of the Fathers, more especially of Irenæus and Tertullian; and gives the following reasons for such passages appearing in their writings: As, "first, the dispute between the Gnostics and the orthodox Christians; in which, the latter, to prove the truth and authenticity of their doctrines, appealed to the institutions and precepts of the apostles, preserved with a sacred veneration by their successors. To this reasoning," says he, "the Gnostics could make no other objection than by saying, that the churches which the apostles had founded, had gradually deviated from their tenets; that others, ignorant of the true apostolical doctrine, had forcibly succeeded to the place of the first bishops, instituted by the apostles themselves. Which *Irenæus* foreseeing, shews, that the bishops of the church of Rome, which, for the sake of brevity, he singles out, descended in an uninterrupted series from the apostles; and that their succession was neither disturbed, nor debased, by the intervention of any foreigner, or of any one who swerved from the opinions of the apostles.

"This single observation throws great light on the manner of his disputation; and alone shews, how greatly they err, who at present call in the assistance of *tradition and apostolical succession*, contending that they do it by the example of the first teachers of the church†."

He

* Sæc. ii. § 21.

† "Hujus ratiocinationi non aliter occurrere poterant Gnostici, quam dicendo, ecclesias, quas apostoli condiderant, à

He observes, that "neither Tertullian, nor Irenæus, assign more authority to the church of Rome, than to other apostolical churches*."

In Tertullian's words he speaks of the church of Rome, as "enjoying a *greater felicity* in being honoured with the particular presence of St. Peter, St. James, and St. John, but *no pre-eminence*."

He remarks too, that "both these writers pass over in silence the *first* of the primitive churches, which was that of *Jerusalem*, the head and chief of all."

Having thus shewn wherein Irenæus and Tertullian agree, he proceeds to point out wherein they differ. "The former, Irenæus, bestows *many privileges* on the church of Rome, while the latter, Tertullian, only allows it a *superior happiness*."

The reason of this diversity in their sentiments he imputes to the many favours Irenæus had received from that church." The important passage, on which the Romanists lay such stress, which they represent as "*most galling to all who have shaken off the yoke of the Roman church*," and by

"sententiis eorum sensum defecisse, atque vi primorum episcoporum ab ipsis apostolis institutorum locum successisse alios vere disciplinæ apostolicæ ignaros. Quod prævidens IRENÆUS, ostendit, ecclesiæ Romanæ, *quam unicum instar offendentis causa jubet*, episcopos non interrupta serie ab apostolis descendere, successionemque eorum nullius hominis peregrinatur, que a dogmatibus apostolorum devii interventu turbatam et contaminatam esse. Hæc una observatio plurimum lucis huic disputandi rationi affert, solaque ostendit, quantum admittant errorem, qui hodie traditionem et apostolicam successionem in auxilium vocant, seseque exemplo primorum ecclesiæ doctorum hoc facere contendunt."

* "Nullo, quod apertum est, discrimine has ecclesias apostolicas disjungit TERTULLIANUS: *Omnibus eandem auctoritatem et dignitatem tribuit: Romana ecclesia non major ipsi videtur et ad dirimendam litem illam cum Gnosticis potentior* Epheſina, Thematonicensis, Corinthiaca," &c. p. 260.

which "she esteems herself more eminent than all other churches," is contained in the words of Irenæus.

"It is necessary that every church; that is the faithful, who are every where, should come to this, i. e. the church of Rome, as having a more desirable principality, and as preserving that tradition which is from the apostles †."

On which he remarks ‡, 1st, "The obscurity of what Irenæus means, owing to the ignorance of the

"Celebre illud, quod apud IRENÆUM est, ecclesie Romanæ elogium, quod REN. MASSUETUS "molestissimum" dicit esse omnibus, qui "Romanæ ecclesie et catholicæ fidei jugum excusserunt." In quo Romani Pontificis amici maxime positum esse censent præsidium potentie, quæ se supra omnes ecclesias eminare Romanæ putat, &c." p. 261.

† "Postquam IRENÆUS dixerat, se unius Romanæ ecclesie ex omnibus Apostolicis auctoritatem ac disciplinam Gnosticis obducere velle, quoniam brevitati studendum sibi esse, hæc subicit: "Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam (Romanensem) propter potiorem principalem necessitas est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique, fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea, quæ est ab Apostolis tradita." Hæc illa verba sunt, quæ tot subtiles & laboriosas disceptationes pepererunt. Atqui hæc potissimum fulcro si nititur jus illud, quod in omnes reliquas Christianarum societates sibi arrogat hodierna ecclesia Romana, meo quidem judicio propius à lapsu remotum est."

‡ "Animadvertamus, ne hoc temere dictum videatur, in universum (I.) sensum verborum IRENÆI profectum esse obscurum, neque ex Latini parum sciti ac periti interpretis oratione intelligi clare posse, quænam vis vocabulis illis subjecta sit, ex quibus sententia totius enuntiati pendet. Quid, quæso est potior principatus? Quid sibi vult hæc formula; Convenire ad ecclesiam Romanam? Frustra litigamus de sententia hujus loci, dum Græcus IRENÆUS aliquando in locum proferatur. (II.) Agere IRENÆUM de illa, quæ docere poterat, omnes episcopos & doctores suos in illa disciplina, quam IRENEUS & PAULUS tradiderunt, permansisse."

"Hoc igitur ad hodiernam ecclesiam Romanam trahere velle, idem profectum est, ac si quis Imperatorum Germanicorum, qui Romani etiam dominantur, jura ac potestatem ex

"OCTAVII,

“ the Latin translator; so that,” says he, “ it is
 “ in vain to contend about the purport of this
 “ passage, till the Greek words of *Irenæus* can be
 “ produced.”

2dly,

“ OCTAVII, AUGUSTI, TIBERII, CALIGULÆ, CLAUDII,
 “ primorum ex Augusta Familia Imperatorum Romanorum
 “ juribus & rebus gestis demonstrare velit. Bellum vero homi-
 “ nem & festivum, qui SUTTONII quemdam aut TACITI
 “ locum de AUGUSTI aut TIBERII auctoritate producat, at-
 “ que constare ex illo disputet qua fide erga FRANCISCUM I.
 “ Germanorum hodie principes esse oporteat? Quod huic ho-
 “ mini juris publici consulti respondebunt, id nos illi, qui ex
 “ IRENÆI loco cognosci posse censeat, quamvis potestate
 “ BENEDICTUS XIV. Pontifex maximus Romanus præditus
 “ sit.”

“ IH. “ Privati hominis hoc testimonium esse, exilis cujusdam
 “ & ante paucos annos natæ in Gallia ecclesiæ episcopi, homi-
 “ nis præterea, qui non pauca in libris suis edidit documenta
 “ rationis parum purgatæ, mentisque in disputando non satis
 “ sibi relicta. Ecquis vero statuat vir prudens & rerum peri-
 “ tus, ex privatorum hominum dictis & præceptis, & quod
 “ majus est, ex hominum parum consideratorum, errorisque
 “ non unius convictorum sententiis & judiciis jura rerum publi-
 “ earum & ecclesiarum publice metienda & demonstranda esse?
 “ Justum vero si quis hoc esse velit, habemus qui cum IRENÆO
 “ conferri potest, hominem judicio & ingenio illo non interio-
 “ rem TERTULLIANUM, qui negat, *ulla re alia, quam felici-
 “ tate*, Romanam ecclesiam reliquis excellentiorem esse. Quod
 “ igitur auctoritate IRENÆI Romanæ Ecclesiæ clientes affirma-
 “ bunt, id nos TERTULLIANI auctoritate negabimus.”

“ Nunc attentius inspiciamus IRENÆI verba. Ait ille;
 “ *Necesse est omnem ecclesiam convenire ad ecclesiam Romanam*.”
 “ idque binas propter causas: Primum, “ *propter potorem
 “ principalitatem*.” Deinde, “ *Quia semper in ea conservata
 “ est apostolorum traditio*.” Præcepti istius quænam sit sen-
 “ tentia, non satis liquet. Veri tamen simillimum est: “con-
 “ venire ad ecclesiam Romanam,” idem esse, quod: *accedere
 “ ad Romanam ecclesiam, seu consulere ecclesiam Romanam,*
 “ atque IRENÆUM hoc dicere velle; Christianos omnes in re-
 “ bus dubiis ad religionem pertinentibus explorare debere sen-
 “ tentiam ecclesiæ Romanæ, & illius quidem, quæ tam exta-
 “ bat, eo quod omnium ecclesiarum occidentis antiquissima,
 “ maxima, & ab Apostolis fundata esset. Hæc si sancti ho-

“ minis

adly, He says, "Irenæus treats of that church of Rome which existed in the second century; and which could assert, that all its bishops and doctors had continued in the discipline of PETER and PAUL. But to transfer this to the modern church of Rome, is the same as if the emperors of Germany, merely because they call themselves Roman emperors, should endeavour to assume the rights and powers of Othavius or Tiberius. And it would be extremely ridiculous if any

minis mens est, esse vero adjectæ rationes demonstrant fere, nihil certe in ea est, quod Romanam ecclesiam valde juvet. Nunquam vero vel subtilissimus disputator efficiet, de ecclesia Romana omnium ætatum & temporum, IRENÆUM verba sua intelligi voluisse. Nos e contrario ex posteriori rationum, quibus scitum suum firmat, probare solide possumus, eam de antiquiori tantum & prima de ætatis sue ecclesia Romana loqui. Dicit enim, ideo veniendum esse ad ecclesiam Romanam, quia, "in ea traditio Apostolorum conservata est." De præterito tempore clare disserit. Si ecclesiam Romanam omnium ætatum audiendam esse putasset, scripseret: in qua traditio apostolorum conservata est, *et semper conservabitur.* Prior vero ratio, quam in potiori principalitate ponit luce prorsus & evidentia caret. *Principalitatis* enim vocabulum quoniam ambiguum fit & ad complures res accommodari queat, IRENÆUS vero, saltem Latinus interpres ejus, non indicet, quodnam "*principalitatis*" genus intelligat, tota ejus sententia in tenebris jacet. Ego quidem arbitror, "*principalitatis*" nomine, IRENÆUM quatuor illa decora ecclesiæ Romanæ, quæ paullo antea enumeraverat, significare, magnitudinem, antiquitatem, celebritatem, origines Apostolicas: *Maxima,* inquit, "*et antiquissima, et omnibus cognita, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis, Petro et Paulo, fundata et constituta ecclesia.*" Hæc est potior illa, quam prædicat, *principalitas* Romanæ ecclesiæ: de alia ejus ætate non cogitabatur. Saltim hæc verborum ejus explicatio tantum habet firmitatis & evidentie, quantum nulla habet alia. Verum desino, alia licet in promptu sint, quæ monere possim. Dedecet profecto viros eruditos & sapientes, ex verbis obscuris & incertis privati hominis & unius pusille ac pauperis ecclesiæ episcopi, boni quidem & pii, verum mediocri acuminis ac ingenio præditi; jus publicum totius ecclesiæ Christianæ atque formam gubernationis ejus a CHRISTO præscriptam elicere."

" WRITER

“ writer should produce a particular passage from
 “ Suetonius or Tacitus respecting the authority
 “ of Augustus or Tiberius; and argue, that from
 “ thence it is evident, what allegiance the present
 “ princes of Germany should give to Francis I.
 “ The same reply that the lawyers would make to
 “ such a person, do we make to those who think it
 “ may be ascertained from a passage of *Irenæus*,
 “ on what grounds the authority of the present
 “ pope is founded.”

He, 3dly, observes, That “ this is but the testi-
 “ mony of an individual, and of one who, from
 “ his writings, appears to have been ill qualified
 “ for controversy, and of moderate abilities. But
 “ what prudent man could imagine, that the pub-
 “ lic rights of states and churches are to be mea-
 “ sured, or proved, by the words or injunctions of
 “ individuals; especially of those who have been
 “ convicted of more than one error in their judg-
 “ ments? But if any one should deem this equita-
 “ ble, we have one who may be compared with
 “ *Irenæus*, I mean *Tertullian*, a man not inferior to
 “ him in judgment or understanding; who denies
 “ that the church of Rome is more excellent than
 “ others in any thing but felicity. What, there-
 “ fore, the advocates of the church of Rome shall
 “ affirm on the authority of *Irenæus*, that will we
 “ deny on the authority of *Tertullian*.”

Let us now more attentively consider the words
 of *Irenæus* — “ To meet or go to the church of
 “ Rome, is the same as to consult it, and *Irenæus*
 “ means to say, that all Christians, in doubtful
 “ cases relating to religion, ought to enquire what
 “ is the opinion of the Roman church, as it then
 “ existed; because it was the greatest and most an-
 “ cient of the western churches, and founded by
 “ the apostles.—If this is the meaning of the holy
 “ man, and that it is, the reasons annexed prove
 “ almost

“ almost to a demonstration, there is *nothing* which
 “ can be of such *great assistance* to the church of
 “ Rome: Nor will the most subtle disputant ever
 “ make it out, that *Irenæus* intended his words to
 “ be understood of the church of Rome of *all ages*.
 “ We, on the contrary, *can evidently prove* from
 “ the latter reason he gives for his opinion, that he
 “ speaks *only* of the ancient and first church of Rome
 “ of *his time*. For, he says, we are to repair to
 “ the church of Rome, because the tradition of the
 “ apostles *has* ever been preserved in it. He clear-
 “ ly speaks of the *past time*. If he had thought
 “ that the church of Rome of *all times* should be
 “ heard, he would have written, in which the tra-
 “ dition of the apostles *has* been, and ever will be
 “ preserved.”

With respect to his first reason, “ a more desire-
 “ able *principality*, it is totally obscure. For the
 “ word *principality*, being applicable to so many
 “ things, its ambiguity involves the sentence in
 “ impenetrable darkness.—I am of opinion, that
 “ by this word *Irenæus* signifies the four great or-
 “ naments of the church of Rome, its *magnitude*,
 “ *antiquity*, *celebrity*, and *apostolical origin*: the
 “ which he had just before enumerated. Neither
 “ did he think of any future state of it. At least
 “ *this* interpretation has *more evidence* than any
 “ other: I desist, therefore, though other argu-
 “ ments are at hand. It is a disgrace certainly to
 “ wise and learned men, to found the public preroga-
 “ tive of the whole Christian church, and the form
 “ of its government, prescribed by Christ himself,
 “ on the *obscure* and *doubtful* words of a *private*
 “ man; and who, though a good and pious bishop
 “ of one poor small church, yet was endowed with
 “ a *moderate share* of discernment and judgment.”

I hope my reader is now convinced, that the loose
 and rhetorical style of the Fathers, thus cleared up
 and

and explained, does not appear so favourable to the pretensions of Rome as Mr. G. would persuade us.

I have dwelt long on this point. But a Protestant, writing principally to Protestants, could not omit this confutation of Mr. G.'s insinuation in favour of the pretensions of Rome: And I shall leave it to himself, or to others, to account for this strange and unnatural alliance of infidelity and superstition, and for his more than once becoming the advocate of Popery, while he is attacking Christianity.

I have already given three instances of Mr. G.'s misrepresenting Mosheim on subjects in which other authors received the same ill treatment: I come now to a fourth instance, in which this writer alone is concerned.

IV.

After passing some encomiums on his favourite divine Dr. Middleton, our Historian endeavours to traduce the *just* character which Mosheim gives of him, by stiling it *indignation*.

“ From the indignation of Mosheim,” says he, “ (against Middleton) we may discover the sentiment of the Lutheran divines *.”

This representation does not lead us to expect the words of Mosheim to be so *impartial and free from invective*, as the following are;—he says,

“ Some years ago there lived a man in England, in other respects of an excellent genius, and endued with a more than common share of learning, named CONYERS MIDDLETON, who, having published a volume sufficiently large, condemned the whole body of Christians of Levity, for giving such easy credit to miracles, and was bold to pronounce all those things to be *false*,

* Note 78. c. xv.

“ concerning

“ concerning the extraordinary miracles of the first
 “ ages, and the gifts of the holy spirit; which
 “ have been handed down to us by the testimony
 “ and writings of so many of the ancients.” *A*
Free Enquiry into the miraculous Powers, &c. Lond.
 1749, in 4to *.

Mosheim also judiciously remarks, that “ the
 “ divinity of the Christian religion does not de-
 “ pend on the credit of the miracles, which are
 “ said to be wrought in the *second* and *third* ages;
 “ but is sufficiently established, provided it be cer-
 “ tain that CHRIST and his followers had the
 “ power of changing the laws of nature. But to
 “ a person attentively reading the learned author’s
 “ treatise it is manifest, that while he seems only to
 “ aim at *more modern miracles*, *he strikes at those of*
 “ *CHRIST and his apostles*; and wishes to over-
 “ throw the credit of all events exceeding the
 “ powers of nature †.”

The candid reader, acquainted with Middleton,
 will not easily discover with Mr. G., any *indigna-*
tion here expressed. Does not Mosheim allow him
 to *have an excellent genius, and uncommon share of*

* “ A-qui ante aliquot tamen annos inter Britannos extitit
 “ vir alioquin ingenio excellenti, doctrinaque haud vulgari præ-
 “ ditus, CONYERS MIDDLETON, qui satis magno volumine
 “ emissio, universam gentem Christianam levitatis in hac re
 “ condemnnavit, omniaque falsa pronuntiare ausus est, quæ tunc
 “ veterum ore ac culamo de extraordinariis Spiritus S. donis &
 “ primorum sæculorum miraculis memoriz prodita sunt. “ *A*
 “ *Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers,*” &c. Lond. 1749.
 in 4to. Hist. Christian. ante Constant. M. §. v. p. 221.
 not.

† “ Neque enim divinitas Christianæ religionis ex fide mi-
 “ raculorum pender, quæ secundo & tertio facta dicuntur sæ-
 “ culo, sed firmata satis est, modo CHRISTUM, ejusque ami-
 “ cos potestate valuisse naturæ leges mutandi conflet. Veram
 “ viri eruditi librum attente legenti perspicuum fit, eum per
 “ latus *recentiorum* miraculorum, CHRISTI & apostolorum mi-
 “ racula petere, omniumque eventuum naturæ vires excede-
 “ rium fidem labefactare velle.”

learning?

learning ? He gives us merely an account of the treatise, and passes his judgment on it: How just it is, and free from indignation, I leave those to judge who have considered the matter, and who have seen the treatises written against it. But, I suppose, as Mosheim takes off the veil, and lays open the design of this work to the eyes of the world, it might appear as very severe treatment to his admirer and copier Mr. G.

V.

Mr. G. says, "The want of discipline and human learning was supplied by the occasional assistance of the *prophets*; who were called to that function without distinction of age, of sex, or of natural abilities; and who, as often as they felt the divine impulse, poured forth the effusions of the spirit in the assembly of the faithful *."

To this he adds the following note †.

"For the prophets of the primitive church, see Mosheim, *Dissertationes ad Hist. Eccles. pertinentes*, tom. ii. p. 132—208." This author, he appeals to, does not corroborate the whole of what he says respecting the prophets. Mosheim's principal design is to prove, that "the gift of prophecy was not confined to foretelling future events, nor yet to interpreting the scriptures alone," as some understand it; but he is far from *excluding* the assistance of human learning. As a proof of this, I shall lay before my reader only the following passage.

"To profess my opinion freely," says Mosheim, "of those who are stiled *prophets* in the New Testament, I think they were men called and moved by God in an *extraordinary* manner, su-

* Page 488.

† Note 104. c. xv.

* *per*naturally illuminated, and taught by God, and
 " excited to deliver the divine will in a public dis-
 " course, according to the need of the rising Chris-
 " tian congregation, either for *instruction*, or *ad-*
 " *vice*, or for *correction*, as most tended to its wel-
 " fare *."

In this concise account of his opinion, Mosheim we see takes no notice of a deficiency in *human* learning, which these prophets were to remedy. Neither does he once intimate it through his whole dissertation. His words rather imply, that the Christian congregations had *teachers* in ordinary, whose *capacities* to teach were acquired in the *usual* way †. But Mr. G. would represent the first Christian congregations as entirely *destitute of discipline and human learning*; to agree the better, I should imagine, with the description he has given of *their meanness and ignorance*.

VI.

In this instance, I mean to shew that our author gives only *a part* of Mosheim's opinion with regard to the progress of the Gospel.

" But neither the belief," says Mr. G., " nor
 " the wishes of the fathers" (in their account of

* " Hinc illos, qui in Novo Test. Prophetæ appellantur,
 " ut plane sententiam meam profitear, homines fuisse, opinor,
 " *extra ordinem* a Deo vocatos & excitatos, supernaturali modo
 " illuminatos & de voluntate divina edoctos, ætiosque, ut
 " eam pro diversa nascentis ecclesie Christiani ratione, vel ad
 " erudiendum, vel ad *commonendum*, vel ad *corrigendum* in
 " publica concione traderent, salutisque ejus ita consulerent."
 Dissert. tom. ii. cap. iii. § 2. p. 165. See also cap. i. § 32. p.
 154. c. ii. § 8. p. 179. § 13. p. 194.

† See St. Paul's epistle to Timothy, c. iv. 13. " Give at-
 " tendance to *reading*." This injunction was hardly necessary,
 if " the *occasional* assistance of the prophets supplied the want of
 " *human learning*," as our historian is pleased to assert.

K

the

the amazingly extensive progress of the Gospel) "can alter the truth of history. It will still remain an undoubted fact, that the barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the Roman monarchy, were involved in the darkness of paganism; and that even the conversion of Iberia, of Armenia, or of Æthiopia, was not attempted with any degree of success, till the scepter was in the hands of an orthodox emperor*." In support of the above, he refers us to "the fourth century of Mosheim's history of the church †."

The learned historian does indeed observe, that "as Constantine and his successors exerted their utmost endeavours to enlarge the limits of Christianity, it is no wonder that so many nations, before barbarous and savage, subjected themselves to Christ."

Yet it should be noted also, that he says, in the very next sentence, that "the less as well as greater Armenia had the light of Christianity brought to them *not long after its first rise*, is probable from many circumstances. But the church received its form and establishment in this age †." Again he adds, "Part of the Goths, who inhabited Thracia, Mœsia, and Dacia, had re-

* Page 512.

† Note 176. c. xv.

‡ Institut. Hist. Ecclesiast. sec. iv. pars i. c. 1.

SECT. 19. "In proferendis civitatis Christianæ finibus, quum non mediocrem CONSTANTINUS ipse cum filiis & successoribus collocaret industriam, non mirum est, populos multos, barbaros antea & immanes, CHRISTO sese subjecisse."

"Armeniz tam minori, quam majori, religionis Christianæ lucem non diu post initia civitatis Christianæ illaram esse, multis rebus probabile sit. Firmitatem vero & formam hoc demum sæculo ecclesiæ accepit Armenica."

"ceived

“ceived the Christian religion *long before this century*: And *Theophilus* their bishop was present at the council of *Nice* *.”

Mr. G. has plainly adopted but *a part* of Mosheim's sentiment, while, from his reference, we should imagine he had the authority of that skilful writer for the *whole* of his observation. The partiality of the extract, therefore, is not the only thing blameable. Our author has presumed to *alter the truth of Mosheim's history*, that he might have an opportunity of contradicting *the belief and wishes of the Fathers* †.

VII.

This partiality seems to be generally adopted by our historian, in his use of Mosheim, as will appear also from this instance :

“The most sceptical criticism,” says he, “is obliged to respect the truth of this extraordinary fact, and the integrity of this celebrated passage of Tacitus (namely, on Nero's persecution). The former is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment

* Sect. 21. “Gothorum Thraciam, Mœsiam, Daciam incolentium pars jam ante hoc sæculum Christianam religionem receperat : & THEOPHILUS episcopus eorum in Nicæno concilio præsens erat.” This council was assembled by Constantine, A. D. 325.

† I would here point out to my reader, though our censor of the Fathers looks on their testimony as insufficient, nay even as *false*, that the candid Mosheim, to whose authority Mr. G. appeals, admits them, as *unexceptionable witnesses* in this case. He says, “Ad quas sigillatim provincias, vel in orbe Romano, vel extra illum, lux veri cœlestis hoc sæculo primum pervenerit, veterum monumentorum penuria distincte commemorare vetat. Adsunt, qui docent, *testes exceptione superiores*, in universo fere Oriente, inter Germanos, Iberos, Celtas, Britannos, & alios populos Christum pro Deo cultum fuisse.” Tertullianus, Irenæus, &c.

" which Nero inflicted on the Christians, a sect of
 " men who embraced a *new* and *criminal* supersti-
 " tion *." He then cites, in a note, " Sueton. in
 " Nerone, c. 16." and continues it thus:

" The epithet of *malefica*, which some sagacious
 " commentators have translated *magical*, is con-
 " sidered by the more rational Mosheim as only sy-
 " nonymous to the *exitiabilis* of Tacitus †."

Mosheim does not represent these terms as *syno-*
nymous: He only says, that there might be the
 same reason for each historian to adopt that lan-
 guage †.

The literal interpretation of his words is, " on
 " this account," (that is, " because the Christians
 " despised the religion of the Romans, and en-
 " deavoured to convert men from it; and be-
 " cause this was prejudicial to the welfare of the
 " republic, which had a necessary connection with
 " the religion of Rome") " Tacitus reproaches
 " the Christians with a *hatred for all mankind*: Nor
 " do I think that he had any other cause for call-
 " ing the Christian religion *superstitionem exitiabi-*
 " *lem*; nor Suetonius for styling it *maleficam* §.

* Page 534.

† Note 34. c. xvi.

‡ The learned Maclaine translates these words thus, " a poi-
 " sonous or malignant superstition." This is rather different from
 the epithet of Mr. G., " a new and criminal superstition."

See Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History,
 vol. i. p. 57. 8vo. edit.

§ " Hoc illud est," (nempe, " quod Christiani publicam rei-
 " publicam religionem, cujus summa erat cum forma civitatis
 " Romanæ necessitudo & conjunctio, contemnebant & detesta-
 " bantur) quod TACITUS Christianis exprobat, *odium generis*
 " *humani*: Nec aliunde potem duci debere, cur idem Christia-
 " norum religionem *superstitionem exitiabilem*, Suetonius au-
 " tem *maleficam* nominet." Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. i. pars i.
 c. v. § 6.

From

From these words, Mr. G. cannot prove, that Mosheim looked on these epithets of Suetonius and Tacitus as *synonymous*: And though our author throws out a sneer by calling those persons *sagacious* who differ from him in not adopting the *rational* interpretation of Mosheim; it should be remembered, that the translation, *magical*, has been dignified by the authority of many learned and able men. It should be noted too that Mr. G. guides us by no particular reference; perhaps he would not wish to refer us to a place in Mosheim, where we might read how groundless the reasons were, which each of the historians had for using such language; perhaps it was left we should discover he had *strained* the words of Mosheim, in order to corroborate his assertion.

VIII.

"The learned Mosheim," says our advocate for the heathens, "expresses himself (p. 147. 232.) "with the highest approbation of Pliny's moderate and candid temper*."

In opposition to this we may affirm, that Mosheim does not give his approbation *indiscriminately* of the *whole* conduct of Pliny, as our author has done; but *highly blames and reproves* even his letter to the emperor respecting the Christians: For he speaks of it as "*unjust and quite unbecoming so judicious a man*†." These can hardly be called with

* Note 56. c. xvi.

† "PLINIUS scripserat ei (TRAJANO) ipsam Christianorum perseverentiam crimen sibi visum esse morte luendam, tametsi nihil in religione, quam dimittere nolebant, desiderari posset. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset quod faterentur, per-
vicaciam certe & inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri."

with propriety, *expressions of the highest approbation*. He passes also a similar judgment on the *answer of Trajan to Pliny*, saying, "That he was *guilty of no small fault in adopting the advice of Pliny, and condemning the Christians to death*, who had forsaken the religion of their ancestors, and would not *apostatize* *." In the same strain of *disapprobation* he speaks, in his General Church History, of the *inconsistent* conduct of the Roman magistrates; of their cruel punishments, and the dreadful issue of the popular clamours †. "To these indeed," says he, "the favourable edict of Trajan did set bounds;" yet this very edict "caused many Christians to be put to death, even under the best emperors ‡."

How widely different is this language of Mosheim from that of the *highest approbation*, which our author represents him as bestowing on the governor. Nor does it differ less from Mr. G's encomium on the *moderate* Trajan's answer, which,

"Eam PLINII sententiam, *injustam licet & viro tam perspicaci plane indignam, amplectebatur imperator*, Christianosque propterea non ut homines in Deos & sacra Romana peccantes, verum ut cives mandatis principis parere nolentes puniri jubebat." De rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. p. 234. not.

* "Peccavit quidem in eo non leviter (Trajanus), quod Christianos desertæ majorum religionis convictos & cedere nolentes capitali pœna jussit affici." Institut. Hist. Eccles. sæc. i. pars i. c. v. § 9.

† See sæc. ii. pars i. c. i. § 2. and c. ii. § 1.

‡ Sæc. 2. "Hæc Trajani lex inter publicas Romani imperii sanctiones relata, hostium Christianorum furori modum quidem ponebat, at efficiebat etiam ut sub *optimis* quoque imperatoribus *multi Christianorum perirent*. Quoties enim aderat, qui accusandi periculum haud formidabat, accusatus vero objectum crimen non diffitebatur; carnisfici tradi poterat, si a CHRISTO desciscere nollet. *Constantia* ergo in religione Christiana ex lege Trajani capitale delictum erat."

in

in his opinion, "displays not the implacable zeal
"of an inquisitor," but "discovers as much re-
"gard for justice and humanity as could be recon-
"ciled with his mistaken notions of religious po-
"licy *."

IX.

Our author assumes to himself the most unaccountable liberty of censuring Mosheim for an assertion which he does not really make. It is thus introduced :

"The leisure of the two empresses, of his" (Diocletian's) "wife Prisca, and of Valeria his daughter, permitted them to listen with more attention and respect to the truths of Christianity, which in every age has acknowledged its important obligations to female devotion †."

On this passage he makes the following note :
"The expression of Lactantius (de M. P. c. 15.) "*sacrificio pollui coegit*," implies their antecedent conversion to the faith ; but does not seem to justify the assertion of Mosheim, (p. 912.) that "*they had been privately baptized ‡*."

Now the words of Mosheim are simply these :
"Prisca, the wife of Diocletian, being *privately initiated* in the Christian religion, had renounced the worship of the Gods §." This expression, surely, need not be confined to the rite of baptism,

* P. 541. This, by the way, is no pleasing picture of the excellence of polytheism, though drawn by the hands of so great a favourer.

† Page 564.

‡ Note 131. c. xvi.

§ "Præterea uxor ejus, Prisca, Christianis sacris clam initiata, cultui Deorum renuntiaverat." De reb. Christian. sæc. iv. pars i. c. i. § 1.

and may imply no more than our author's expression, "their antecedent conversion to the faith."

How then could Mr. Gibbon be so presumptuous, as falsely to charge such an eminent man with *unjustifiable assertion*? Besides, his reference to Mosheim does not lead us to discover even the name of *Valeria*. We read only, "The palaces of the emperors themselves were filled with Christians; nor did any one obstruct them in their free and fearless profession of Christianity*." This is speaking only in *general* terms. Much less does the Christian Mosheim give our infidel historian any pretext for inserting that illiberal malignant insinuation, "*Christianity has, in every age, acknowledged its important obligations to FEMALE devotion.*" The remark is truly contemptible.

Misrepresentation of DUPIN.

Our author, in treating of the discipline of the primitive church, has strained some passages in Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, to make them coincide with his own expressions. He says, "According to the circumstances, or the number of the guilty, the exercise of the Christian discipline was varied by the discretion of the bishops. The councils of Ancyra and Illiberis were held about the same time, the one in Galatia, the other in Spain; but their respective canons, which are still extant, seem to breathe a very different spirit. The Galatian who, after his baptism, had repeatedly sacrificed to idols, might obtain his pardon by a penance of seven years; and, if he had seduced others, only three years

* "Plena erant imperatorum ipsorum palatia Christianis neque quisquam eos impediabat, quo minus libere ac sine formidine Christum profiterentur ac colerent." SÆC. IV. § 1.

" more

“ more were added to the term of his exile. But
 “ the unhappy Spaniard, who had committed the
 “ same offence, was deprived of the hope of re-
 “ conciliation, even in the article of death; and
 “ his idolatry was placed at the head of a list of
 “ *seventeen* other crimes, against which a sentence,
 “ no less terrible, was pronounced. Amongst
 “ these *we may distinguish the inextinguishable guilt of ca-*
 “ *lumniating* a bishop, a presbyter, or even a dea-
 “ con *.”

In support of this sentence, he appeals to Dupin †; and thereby displays great *inaccuracy*, as well as shameful *misrepresentation*. For though the subject of penance is treated of in Dupin †, under the life of *St. Pacien*, nearly where Mr. G. refers us; yet none of the particulars, which he specifies, are there mentioned. Instead of *seventeen* only *three or four* capital crimes are distinguished.

Dupin says, of this Father, “ He first distinguishes *sins* from *crimes*: We must not think,” says he, “ that men are obliged to do penance for
 “ an infinite number of small and more trivial
 “ *sins*.”—And thus, “ having *pardoned* such, if I
 “ may use the expression, there remains a small
 “ number, which it is easy to avoid, and which
 “ he condemns as meriting a severe punishment.”

He makes these crimes relate to “ idolatry, homicide, and adultery. We are to comprehend
 “ under these *three* crimes, their concomitants and

* Page 501.

† Note 146. c. xv. Dupin *Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique*, tom. ii. p. 304—313.

‡ Page 299—311. 8vo. edit. Paris 1687.

It should be observed, that one of Mr. G.'s references, at note 64. c. xv. answers to this edition: We might, therefore, expect that all of them should answer to it.

“ consequences, which are of a wide extent. As
 “ to other sins, they are healed,” says he, “ by
 “ the practice of good works, and their contrary
 “ virtues. But for the three crimes specified, he
 “ recommends public penance in a particular
 “ manner*.”

It is now manifest that there is not a requisite similitude between the account which Dupin gives us, and that cited by our author as from him.

For a proof of the difference between the canons of the councils of Ancyra and Illiberis; between the punishment of the Galatian and Spaniard, for the same offence; on which Mr. G. harangues, he should have referred us to “ the eighth canon of
 “ the council of Ancyra and Neo-Cesaræa†; and
 “ the first canon of Elvira or Illiberis‡;” instead of the place in Dupin, to which he now *inaccurately* directs us.

But there still remains a more important charge, the misrepresentation he is guilty of in the words which close this paragraph: “ Among these *we*

* “ Dans la première partie il distingue les pechez, d’avec
 “ les crimes: Il dit qu’il ne faut pas s’imaginer que les hommes
 “ soient obligés à faire penitence pour une infinité de pechez
 “ legers, dont personne n’est exempt, &c.—Ainsi après avoir par-
 “ donné, pour ainsi dire, une infinité de pechez, sans qu’il soit
 “ besoin de remèdes forts pour les guerir, il y en a un petit nom-
 “ bre qu’il estoit facile d’éviter, qui méritent une severe puni-
 “ tion.” P. 306.

“ Il rapporte ces pechez à l’idolatrie, à l’homicide, & à
 “ l’adultere: pour les autres pechez, dit il, on les guerit par la
 “ pratique des bonnes œuvres.—Par leurs vertus contraires.”

“ Il recommande particulièrement la penitence publique pour
 “ les pechez de l’idolatrie, d’homicide, & de fornication. Il
 “ faut entendre sous ces trois pechez tous les suites de ces crimes
 “ qui s’étendent bien loin.” P. 311.

† Dupin, p. 795. A. D. 304.

‡ Ibid. p. 770. A. D. 305. See also, “ Canon 3. du Con-
 cile du Valence, p. 884.

“ may

" *may distinguish the inextinguishable guilt of calumniating*
 " a bishop, a presbyter, or even a deacon." Even
 this does not occur at the place referred to. The
 authority our historian should have quoted, is,
 " the 75th canon of the council of Elvira," which
 " deprives of the communion, even at death, those
 " *who have FALSELY accused of CRIMES*, a bishop,
 " a priest, or a deacon*."

We should imagine, from our author's representation, that on the slightest expression in conversation, detracting from the character of a priest, this severe punishment was inflicted. Far otherwise is the real state of the case. It evidently implies *a false accusation in public of some great crime*, which is much more than what is commonly understood by mere calumny. But our author, as usual, candidly translates the original words to throw a sneer on the sacred order, even at the expence of his judgment; for the language will not allow the interpretation he has given. In order to make his assertion more specious, he is careful to mention, at the same time, certain crimes of a deep dye; which, he would intimate, a Christian might more safely commit, than be guilty of *calumniating* a bishop, or a deacon. But the words of Dupin strongly express that, to incur this heavy penalty, a person must first have *falsely accused* a priest, in a *public* manner, of some great and *heinous crimes*: Perhaps those of murder, idolatry, or adultery, and their attendants; which are really the crimes here specified, and not those which Mr. G. is pleased *particularly to distinguish*. Besides the crime of false accusation amounts to rank *perjury* in its utmost extent, for which, in

* Le Concile d'Elvire, A. D: 305. p. 780.

" Le 75 canon prive de la communion même à la mort, ceux
 " *qui ont accusé de faux crimes*, un Evêque, un Prêtre, & un
 " Diacre."

those

those days, a severe penance was inflicted. We are to consider also, that it was not only an endeavour to destroy the reputation of an honest innocent man; but that the malignant aspersions were cast on the most respectable characters, the venerable personages on whom the fame and welfare of the Christian church chiefly depended; which was, at that time, a consideration of importance.

Lastly, let us remember what rigid punishments the clergy themselves were liable to, if the accusation appeared *probable*, or even *suspicious*: We may then see some necessity to enact a severe penalty to prevent and deter men from *falsely* accusing them, through envy, malice, or other iniquitous motives.

Misrepresentation of M. de TILLEMONT.

Mr. G. says, "Christianity must have been very unequally diffused over Pontus, for in the middle of the third century there were no more than seventeen believers in the extensive diocese of Neo-Cæsarea *." He then quotes M. de Tillemont †.

But he has very partially represented the case, and mentioned only *one part* of Tillemont's remark, to prove which, I shall transcribe the whole.

"The city of Neo-Cæsarea," says this author, "was either the capital, or one of the most considerable cities of the province, when St. Gregory was made bishop of it, and it was very populous, as well as all the neighbouring country. But all the inhabitants, both of the city and its environs, were still immersed in the darkness of paganism; and they could reckon no more than

* Note 154. c. xv.

† Mémoires Ecclesiastiques, tom. iv. p. 675.

“ *seventeen Christians* there. Notwithstanding the
 “ *grace of God wrought in such a wonderful man-*
 “ *ner by St. Gregory, that he converted all the peo-*
 “ *ple both of the city and country, and only left at*
 “ *his death seventeen pagans.**”

Our author has fully answered *his purpose* of shew-
 ing the *small number* of Christians in the diocese,
 by laying before us only the first part of Tillemont's
 remark; and by concealing from our view the
amazing increase of converts to the faith in Pontus,
 which this writer takes notice of in the very same
 connected passage †. It should be observed also,
 that Tillemont's authority relates only to the city
 and its environs; and that he does not speak of *the*
whole extensive diocese, as Mr. G. has represented
 him.

Misrepresentation of GREGORY of TOURS.

Our speaking of the progress of the Gospel in
 this place, has induced me to reserve the following
 instance, on account of the connection of the subject.

Mr. G. refers to this Father, among other writ-
 ters, in proof of “ the slow progress of the Gospel

“ Elle, (la ville de Neo-Cesaree) étoit donc ou la capitale,
 “ ou l'une des plus considerables villes de la province, lorsque
 “ St. Gregoire en fut fait Evêque, & fort peuplée, aussi-bien que
 “ tout le pays d'alentour. Mais tous les habitants & de la ville
 “ & des environs estoient encore dans les ténèbres du paganisme,
 “ & l'on n'y pouvoit compter que dix-sept *Chrétiens*. Cepen-
 “ dant la grace de Dieu opéra tellement par S. Gregoire qu'il
 “ *convertit tout le peuple* tant de la ville que de la campagne &
 “ n'y laissa en mourant que dix-sept *payens*.” Partie 2de.
 p. 675. 8vo. edit.

† From this representation of Tillemont, we must infer, that
 our historian had little reason to question the veracity of Lucian's
 expression, when he says, that “ his native country of Pontus
 “ was filled with Epicureans and *Christians*. This was under
 “ the reign of Commodus. Lucian. in Alexand. c. 25.”

“ in

“ in Gaul :” And that, “ even as late as the reign
 “ of Decius, in a few cities only some scattered
 “ churches were supported by the devotion of a
 “ small number of Christians *.”

In direct opposition to this, Gregory says, that
 “ under the reigns of *Hadrian* and *Antoninus*
 “ many had even suffered martyrdom in the pro-
 “ vinces of Gaul †.”

And again, that “ under the emperor Decius
 “ there arose many persecutions against the Chris-
 “ tians, and the slaughter of the faithful was so
 “ great, that they could not be numbered ‡.”

By this we are induced to reckon the number of
 Christians there *very great* ; and deem that church
 to be *populous* which could afford so many martyrs.

The other writers, especially Mosheim, do in-
 deed confirm the assertion of Mr. G. ; but here
 again he has blended together such opposite testi-
 mony, that at once prove, *he has not consulted the*
original authors ; but has decked himself out with
 plumes that belong to another.

II.

There is still another *misrepresentation* of TIL-
 LEMONT. Our author says, “ St. Jude the apostle
 “ was the *brother* of Jesus Christ §.” To account
 for this expression he adds, in a note,

“ This appellation was at first understood in
 “ the most obvious sense, and it was supposed,

* P. 511. and note 171. c. xv. Greg. Turon. l. i. c. 28.

† “ Sed et in Gallis multi pro Christi nomine sunt per mar-
 tyrium gemmis cælestibus coronati : Quorum passionum historie
 “ apud nos fideliter usque hodie retinentur.” l. i. c. 26.

‡ “ Sub Decio vero imperatore multa bella adversum nomen
 “ Christianum exoriantur, & tanta strages de credentibus fuit, ut
 “ nec numerari queat.” Gregorius Turonensis Historia Fran-
 corum, l. i. c. 28. edit. Ruinart. Adrian & Antonin. Impp.

§ Page 538.

“ that the brothers of Jesus were the *lawful issue of Joseph and Mary* *.” “ See Tillemont *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, tom. i. part iii. and Beausobre, &c.”

But Tillemont is very far from saying that “ the brothers of Jesus Christ were supposed to have been the *lawful issue of Joseph and Mary*: He speaks of the *error of Helvidius* as arising from this opinion †.” And in one passage he expressly makes use of words directly opposite to this opinion. “ For, speaking of St. Jude,” he says, “ Jude is called the brother of Jesus Christ (because he was the son of Mary, *sister of the Holy Virgin*, and of Cleophas the *brother of Joseph* ‡.”)

It is plain, surely, beyond a doubt, that Tillemont was of a very different way of thinking. Is it not then much more probable that Mr. G. took the whole of his note from Beausobre §? Every remark he makes on this topic, may be extracted from this writer, who, as he quotes Tillemont, might readily furnish him with his reference to that author. This suspicion is still more increased by Mr G.'s having given us no particular reference to any chapter in Tillemont, which was probably done with a view to secure his credit.

* Note 47. l. c. xvi.

† “ A donné lieu à l'erreur d'Helvide,” tom. i. part iii.

‡ “ Jude qui est appelé frere de Jesus Christ (parcequ'il étoit fils de Marie, *sœur de la Ste. Vierge*, & de Cleophas frere de S. Joseph).”

§ *Histoire Critique de Manichéisme*, l. ii. c. 22.

There is, perhaps, some impropriety in our author's quoting both Tillemont and Beausobre on this point; for Beausobre corrects the expression of Tillemont.

See tom. i. liv. iii. c. ii. § 9. 4to edit.

“ Corrigeons en passant un mot de M. Tillemont,” &c. p. 360. &c.

Mis-

Misrepresentation of Pagi.

Mr. G. says, "Pliny was sent into Bithynia (according to Pagi) in the year 110*."

Now that accurate chronologist places it "in the year 102: See the fact recorded in his *Critica Historico—Chronologica in Annales C. Baronii* †."

I appeal to my reader, if this anachronism does not plainly prove that our historian never looked into Pagi's chronology, though he has not hesitated to make a pompous reference to him in his note?

Misrepresentation of Lord LYTTTELTON.

Our author says, "Whatever opinion we may entertain of the character or principles of Thomas Becket, we must acknowledge that he suffered death with a constancy not unworthy of the primitive martyrs †." In confirmation of this, he cites the authority of Lord Lyttelton's *History of Henry II.* §

Now whoever turns to the noble author, will find that he gives Mr. G. no ground to make this comparison: But as his Lordship has drawn a dark character of this intrepid defender of papal and ecclesiastical authority, our historian would transfer it to the first Christians, in order to throw a stain on their memories; as if the same turbulence of disposition, which had exposed the one to assassination, had exposed the others to martyrdom,

* Note 155. c. xv.

† Anno Domini 102. p. 99. sec. ii. § 3.

‡ Note 82. c. xvi.

§ Vol. ii. p. 592, &c.

Besides,

Besides, by making this remark, he had an opportunity of paying a compliment to the *papists*, by representing Becket as a saint and martyr; while he gives a *suspicious* view of his *character* and *principles*, to please the protestants."

Having now laid before my reader *such a series* of misrepresentations and misquotations of the authors to whom Mr. Gibbon appeals; can there remain the least doubt, that *he has not really consulted the original materials*; though he so confidently assumes to himself this merit? He has doubtless some obligation to me for having given such satisfying proofs of his skill, in *suiting to his purpose* the arguments of every writer, whose name he thought would give credit to his remark. Every one who had ever looked into Mr. Gibbon's history must have instantly perceived, that his principal design was to paint Christianity in odious colours. But it was not perhaps so generally known, nor could it well be conceived, that, in order to finish his picture, he could have had recourse to such an extensive system of gross misrepresentation as I have exposed to the Public in the foregoing sheets.

Proofs of Mr. GIBBON's INACCURACY.

In the former part of this examination, I occasionally took notice of some few of our author's inaccuracies, being such as were connected with his misquotations. A long list of them, however, which have no connection, still remaining, I am obliged to introduce these under a distinct head.

From the very nature of the charge, the instances which I shall bring in support of it, if *sepa-*
L
rately

fully considered, have the appearance of being trivial. Nay Mr. G., though he cannot throw upon his printer the blame of the numerous misrepresentations above exposed, may avail himself of such an answer here. But I beg my reader would suppose me incapable of confounding mere errors of the printer with real mistakes of the author: And that such are the instances I now produce, may be confidently asserted; for they have all uniformly preserved their place in the *three* several editions of Mr. G.'s history*: I may therefore urge them

* It may be agreeable to my reader to have a view of the alterations and additions which Mr. G. has made in his last edition of his history, which, after an accurate collation of these two chapters, I can affirm to be as follows:

At note 10. 3d edit. he has quoted Numbers xiv. 11.—“How long will this people provoke me? and how long will it be ere they *believe* me, for all the *signs* which I have shewed among them? It would be easy, but it would be unbecoming, to justify the complaint of the Deity from the whole tenor of the Mosaic law.”

At note 64. he has added, “Yet the curious reader may consult Dailé De Ufu Patrum, l. ii. c. 4.”

He makes this addition to note 65. “The testimony of Justin of his own faith, and that of his orthodox brethren in the doctrine of a Millennium, is delivered in the clearest and most solemn manner, (Dialog. cum Tryphonte Jud. p. 177, 178. edit. Benedictin.) If in the beginning of this important passage there is any thing like an inconsistency, we may impute it, as we think proper, either to the author, or to his transcribers.”

An addition, which shall be afterwards mentioned, he has made to note 70. 2d edit.

At note 72. 2d edit. he has cited Irenæus adv. Hæres. Proem. p. 3.

I have already noticed the addition he has made respecting the prudence and humanity of Nero being *asserted*.

He has inserted the following as the 32d note in c. xvi. 3d edit. “*Odio humani generis convicti*.” These words may either signify the hatred of mankind towards the Christians, or the hatred of the Christians towards mankind. I have preferred the

them as a compleat body of proof, in support of my general charge, that he must relinquish his boasted claim to *diligence* and *accuracy*.

the latter sense, as the most agreeable to the style of Tacitus, and to the popular error, of which a precept of the Gospel (see Luke xiv. 26.) had been, perhaps, the innocent occasion.

My interpretation is justified by the authority of Lipsius; of the Italian, the French, and the English translators of Tacitus; of Mosheim (p. 102.); of Le Clerc (*Historia Ecclesiast.* p. 427.); of Dr. Lardner (*Testimonies*, vol. i. p. 345.); and of the Bishop of Gloucester (*Divine Legation*, vol. iii. p. 38.) But as the word *convicti* does not unite very happily with the rest of the sentence, James Gronovius has preferred the reading of *conjuncti*, which is authorised by the valuable MS. of Florence."

At note 42. 2d edit. "See Dodwell *Paucitat. Mart.* l. xiii. The Spanish inscription in Gruter is a manifest and acknowledged forgery, contrived by that noted impostor Cyriacus of Ancona, to flatter the pride and prejudices of the Spaniards. See Ferreras, *Histoire d'Espagne*, tom. i. p. 192."

He has thus enlarged note 116. 2d edit. Euseb. l. vi. c. 28. "It may be presumed, that the success of the Christians had exasperated the increasing bigotry of the Pagans. Dion Cassius, who composed his history under the former reign, had most probably intended for the use of his master those councils of persecution, which he ascribes to a better age, and to the favourite of Augustus. Concerning their oration of Mæcenæ, or rather of Dion, I may refer to my own unbiassed opinion (p. 41. note 25.) and to the Abbé de la Bleterie *Memoires de l'Academie*, tom. xxiv. p. 303. tom. xxv. p. 432."

At page 576. 2d edit. he has altered this sentence. "The motives of conversion, as they may variously be deduced from *faith*, from *virtue*, from policy, or from remorse, &c." he now writes it, p. 691, 692. 3d edit. "The motives of his conversion, as they may variously be deduced from *benivolence*, from policy, from *conviction*, from *remorse*," &c.

He would enforce what he has said at note 178. c. xvi. by asserting, that "such is the *fair* deduction from two remarkable passages in Eusebius," &c.

There are some other alterations which I have omitted, as they are very trivial.

I.

Mr. G. says, "the success of the Gnostics was rapid and extensive*."

To support this, he adds, in the following note: "*Habent apes favos, habent ecclesias et Marcionitæ*†;" is the strong expression of *Tertullian*, which I am obliged to quote from memory ‡.

Mr. G.'s memory has, indeed, failed him here, for *Tertullian's* words are, "*Faciunt favos & ves- pæ; faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitæ* §." Though his inclination prompted him to amend the simile in favour of the *Marcionites*, as much as the useful industrious bee is preferable to the obnoxious wasp.

II.

Mr. G. at note 11. c. xv. refers to "Exodus xxiv. 23." and adds, "See a very sensible note in the Universal History, vol. i. p. 603. edit. fol." But his subject, respecting the Jews appearing three times in the year before the Lord, required him to have referred to Exodus c. xxxiv. 23. or c. xxiii. 14 or 17 verses.

I wish also to inform my reader that p. 603. in the Universal History, which contains the note on this topic, is in vol. ii. not vol. i. edit. folio.

III.

Our historian, in his third edition, has added this note.—"In order to ascertain the degree of

* Page 462.

† That is, "The bees have cells or honey-combs, the Marcionites also have churches."

‡ Note 35. c. xv.

§ "Even the wasps make themselves cells, or nests, and the Marcionites also form churches."

" authority

“ authority which the zealous African” (Tertullian) “ had acquired, it may be sufficient to allege
 “ the testimony of Cyprian, the doctor and guide
 “ of all the western churches (see Prudent.
 “ Hymn. xiii. 100.) As often as he applied himself
 “ to his daily study of the writings of Tertullian,
 “ he was accustomed to say, *Da mihi magistrum*;
 “ *Give me my master.*” Hieronym. de Viris Illu-
 stribus, c. 53*.

The xliith Hymn of Prudentius chiefly relates to the passion of Cyprian, and he is there spoken of as a great teacher; but I do not see what reason Mr. G. had to single out line 60: The words of which are: “ *Nec minus involitat terris nec ab hoc
 “ recedit orbe.*”

IV.

Besides, his other reference in this note is false, as the words which he quotes are found in Hieronym. de Viris Illustribus, c. 63.—*ἐπιδος τον διδασκαλον*, “ *da magistrum.*”

Mr. G. therefore, would have done better not to have added this note, as he has only accumulated his inaccuracies.

V.

Our author, to confirm his remark, that “ the
 “ the community of goods—subsisted in some
 “ degree among the austere sect of the Esseni-
 “ ans†,” appeals to “ Philo de Vit. Contempla-
 “ tiv †.”

But in this treatise Philo makes but slight mention of the Essenians, and *none at all* of any com-

* Note 73. c. xv.

† Page 495.

† Note 127. c. xv.

munity. He speaks of the Therapeutæ, as “withdrawing themselves from this life, through the hopes and desire of immortality, and leaving their possessions to their children or relations*.”

It is highly probable, therefore, that Mr. G. has mistaken the book, since in the preceding one, entitled, “*Whoever studies after virtue, should be free;*” we read the account of their community at large: “Their benevolence,” says Philo, “equality of rank, and admirable community in every respect, are proofs of their philanthropy.

“No one has any peculiar property, which does not belong to all. They live in companies, and extend their beneficence to other societies: They have one common apartment, one table; their cloaths and provisions are common to all†.”

Can we now entertain a doubt, whether, if our author had consulted the original, he could have made this gross blunder?

VI.

In confirmation of his remark on “the divine obligation of the Mosaic law, in the article of

* Τὸ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ——— (οἱ) διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακρίας ζωῆς ἥμερον τιταλιυτηκίνας νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον, ἀπολείπουσι τὰς οὐσίας υἱοῖς ἢ θυγατέρας, ἢτε καὶ ἀλλοῖς συγγενέσιν, ἰκονσίην γνῶμη προσκληρονομώμενοι. Philon. de Vita Contemplativa. P. 473. Ed. Mangey.

† ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΣΠΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΝ.
(*Quod liber sit quisquis virtuti studet.*)

Τοῦ δὲ φιλαθεωποῦ δόγματα ἰσοιαν ἸΣΟΤΗΤΑ, τὸ πάντος λόγου κρείττονα ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑΝ, περὶ ἧς οὐκ ἀκαίρως βραχία ἱστῶ.

Πρῶτον μὲν τούτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἰδίαν, ἢ οὐχὶ πάντα ἴσως συμβέβηκε. Πρὸς γὰρ τῷ κατὰ θιάσους συνοικίῃν, ἀναπίπτεται καὶ τοῖς ἱερέσιν ἀδικουμένοις τῶν ὁμοζήλων. Εἴτ' ἐστὶ ταμίειον ἢ πάντων καὶ δαπάναι, καὶ κοινὰ μὲν ἐσθῆτες, κοινὰ δὲ τροφαὶ συσσίτια πιτυοιμήναι, &c.

“tythes;”

"tythes*," Mr. G. cites Irenæus adv. Hæres. l. iv. c. 27. 34. and Origen in Num. Homil. li. †

Now this subject is treated by Irenæus, l. iv. c. 13. 18. ‡ and by Origen Homil. xi. in Numerorum caput xxiii.

VII.

Mr. G., happy to have a pretext to cast a blemish on the writings of Eusebius, says, "There was, perhaps, some malice in the remark of Theodorus Metochita, that all who, like Eusebius, had been conversant with the Egyptians *delighted* in an obscure and intricate style."

In support of this, he refers us to Valesius's note on Eusebius, lib. viii. c. v. § But the present matter occurs in the annotations of Valesius on l. viii. c. 9. where he says, "From this place we learn that Eusebius had been acquainted with Egypt, as Theodorus Metochita witnesses; who observes, that not only the Egyptians themselves, but those also who had been conversant with the Egyptians, *made use of* a certain intricate and obscure mode of expression in their writings; in the number of whom he ranks Eusebius not in the last place ¶."

* P. 496.

† Note 130. c. xv.

‡ Edit. Grabe. Paris 1710.

§ Note 181. c. xvi.

¶ ἱερογλυφικῶν δὲ τῶν αἰγυπτίων. "Ex hoc loco discimus Eusebium in Ægypto versatum fuisse: quod etiam testatur Theodorus Metochita in collectaneis: quo loco observat omnes non modo, Ægyptios; verum etiam eos qui in Ægypto versati sunt, intricata quadam et obscura dictione in scribendo *usus fuisse*; inter quos non postremo loco recenset Eusebium nostrum."

We see that our author is not only *inaccurate* in this instance, but has *strained* the words of Theodorus Metochita, quoted by M. de Valois. The learning of this translator, probably, informed Mr. G of the words of Metochita. We may surely return the compliment to Mr. G. and observe, *without any malice in the remark, that, all who, like him, have been long conversant with the FRENCH, delight in a gaudy, superficial style: Which, like the gay and flimsy dress that distinguishes Gallic levity, makes up in ostentation what it wants in solid worth and real excellence, to recommend it to the man of sense and judgment.*

VIII.

Mr. G., to corroborate his assertion respecting the Millennium *, has cited "Dupin Bibliothéque Ecclesiastique, tom. i. p. 223. and tom. ii. p. 366†."

The first reference directs us nearly to a passage which mentions *Irenæus* as favouring this doctrine, tom. i. p. 221, 222. † But the second reference gives no direction at all to any similar passage: Neither do we meet with the additional circumstances attending its gradual decline, which Mr. G. has specified, nor are reasons, like his, given for the decay of the doctrine §.

* Page 472.

† Note 64. c. xv.

‡ 8vo edit. à Paris 1688.

§ We read of Justin as holding this doctrine, p. 78. that it was rejected by *Caius*, as the heresy of *Cerintbus*, p. 340. by *Cyprian*, p. 534. and by *Origen*, p. 421. Dupin makes a sensible and candid remark at this place.

"Il faut pardonner ces sortes d'opinions à tous les anciens auteurs du Chrillianisme, n'y en ayant presque pas un seul, qui n'en ait eu de semblables."

IX.

"The philosophers," says Mr. G., "composed many elaborate treatises, which have since been committed to the flames by the prudence of orthodox emperors *."

On this occasion he cites, as one authority, Codex Theodosian. l. i. tit. i. l. 3. †

I do not here mean to dispute the fact, but the incorrectness of this reference calls for severe animadversion. For, lib. i. tit. i. lex 3. Codex Theodosian relates to a very different matter: "The constitutions and edicts of princes ‡."

Mr. G. probably ought to have quoted lib. xvi. tit. v. lex 34. which is, "We enact upon our authority, that the books of the heretics, containing the matter and doctrine of every wickedness, should be searched with the greatest exactness, and brought out; and afterwards be burnt with fire, in the presence of the judges themselves §."

Surely this is a strong instance that our author did not consult this code of laws, otherwise he could not have made a mistake in quoting the very first page.

* Page 566.

† Note 142. c. xvi.

‡ "De Constitutionibus Principum et Edictis."

"Omnia constituta non præteritis calumniam faciunt, sed futuris regulam imponunt. Cod. Theodosian, l. i. tit. i. l. 3.

§ De Hæreticis. "Codices sane eorum, scelerum omnium doctrinam ac materiam continentes, summa sagacitate mox quæri ac prodi exerta auctoritate mandamus, sub aspectibus eorum judicantium mox cremandos." Lib. xvi. tit. v. lex 34. See also lex 66, &c.

X.

X.

Our author refers us to "Seneca Quæst. Natur. I. i. 15." &c. * where we are to find "recorded the great phenomena of nature, earthquakes, eclipses, &c. †"

But the last of these two references is, doubtless, false, as lib. i. c. 15. Naturalium Quæstionum Senecæ, treats of a very different matter from *eclipses*.

XI.

Our author says, "According to the maxims of universal toleration, the Romans protected a superstition which they despised ‡."

For this he refers to Cicero pro Flacco c. 23. § but on examination we shall find that the subject is contained in c. 28. ||

XII.

He observes, that "the Jews were *alarmed* and *scandalized* at the ensigns of paganism which necessarily introduced themselves into a Roman province. **"

And adds, "see in particular *Joseph. Antiquitat. xvii. 6. xviii. 6. ††*"

Each of these chapters treats of a different subject. The point in question is discussed in lib. xvii. c. 9. in which Josephus relates "a se-

* Note 195. c. xv.

† Page 518.

‡ Page 451.

§ Note 5. c. xv.

|| See the Olivet, Glasgow, &c. Editions.

** Page 451.

†† Note 7. c. xv.

" dition

"dition of the Jews after the death of Herod:"
and again we read of their tumults, lib. xviii. c.
4. 9.*

XIII.

Mr. G. appeals for a description of Curubis,
to "Cellarius, Geograph. Antiq. part iii. p. 96 †.
"Shaw's Travels, p. 90;" and adds, "for the
"adjacent country, see l'Afrique de Marmol.
"tom. ii. p. 474. ‡"

But we find this description of Curubis in Dr.
Shaw's Travels, p. 160. § and in l'Afrique de
Marmol. tom. ii. p. 434. || not 474. to which
Mr. G. inaccurately directs us.

XIV.

"Simony," says our author, "was not un-
"known in those times; and the clergy sometimes
"bought what they intended to sell. It appears
"that the bishopric of Carthage was purchased by
"a wealthy matron, named Lucilla, for her ser-
"vant Majorinus. The price was 400 folles."
He then refers to Monument. Antiq. ad Calcem
Optati. p. 263. **

* See Hadson's edition of Josephus, Oxon.

† In Patrick's edition of Cellarius, Curubis is described in
c. xxvi. under the head of *Africa Propria*. Zeugitana, p.
117. His words are, "Curubis is situated on the promontory
"of Mercury, now *Cape Bona*. "Curubis sita supra pro-
"montorium Mercurii (*Ἐλευθερίου ἀκρᾶς*) nunc *Cape Bona*."

‡ Note 81. xvi.

§ Ed. Fol. Oxon. 1738.

|| 4to Ed. Paris 1667.

** Note 126. c. xvi.

Mr.

Mr. G. has referred in one note * to Dupin's edition; but in this edition the passage occurs at p. 170, 171. †; we have then reason to suspect that he did not gain his information from this original.

XV.

Our author, speaking of "the stupendous metamorphosis of St. James, from a peaceful fisherman, into a valorous knight," &c. † cites Mariana " (Hist. Hispan. v. 10. 13.) § " But here again he has displayed great inaccuracy. For the circumstance alluded to by him is related in Mariana. (Hist. Hispan. l. xi. c. 13.) ||

Mariana's account of St. James's arrival in Spain is l. iv. c. 2.—The story of his body being found l. vii. c. 10.

XVI.

Our historian, speaking of "the gardens and circus of Nero on the Vatican," adds "on the same spot, a temple, which far surpasses the ancient glories of the Capitol, has been since erected by the Christian pontiffs, &c. **" The authority he cites is "Nardini Roma Antica, p. 387. †† But he has mistaken the page, for he should have cited l. vii. c. 13. p. 486, 487. ††

* Note 159. c. xvi.

† "Monumenta vetera ad donatistarum historiam pertinentia."

‡ Page 511.

§ Note 174. c. xvi.

|| Fol. edit. Foletti 1592. and

4to edit. Mogunizæ 1605.

** Page 534.

†† Note

33. c. xvi.

†† Edit. 2da in Roma 1704.

XVII.

XVII.

Mr. G. in a note refers to "Theophilus ad Antolychum, l. ii. p. 77;" * whereas he should have written it Antolychum, for that was the name of the Grecian nobleman: Besides, both the fact and page 77, are contained in lib. i. †

XVIII.

He says, "See a very curious Dissertation on the Vestals in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. ii. p. 161—227. †" But l'Histoire des Vestales par M. L'Abbé Nadal is in tom. iv. p. 161—227.

XIX.

Mr. G. says, after speaking of "the mode of persecution which Edward I. practised with great success against the clergy of England: See Hume's History of England, vol. i. p. 300. last 4to edition. §"

Now he should have quoted vol. ii. p. 300, &c.

XX.

An inaccuracy of this kind occurs also at a note where he refers us to "Chrysostom. Opera, tom. vii. p. 658. 810. Ed. Savil. ¶"

His authority is cited in confirmation of this passage:

"The ancient and illustrious church of Antioch consisted of one hundred thousand persons, three thousand of whom were supported out of the public oblations **."

* Note 76. c. xv.

† Note 92. c. xv.

‡ Note 157. c. xv.

† Fol. edit. Lutet.

§ Note 152. c. xvi.

** Page 507.

Now

Now it is highly strange, that this reference exactly answers to the *Benedict* edition, but is not right in the *Savil*. Can we think then that Mr. G. ever consulted the *Savilian* edition?

XXI.

Mr. G. brings discredit on his note 171. c. xv. by referring us to the "Geographia Sacra of Charles de St. Paul, with the observations of Lucas Holsterius." Now the author's name, not unknown in the class of writers, is Holstenius.

XXII.

Mr. G. says, "Many, though very confused, circumstances that relate to the conversion of Iberia and Armenia, may be found in Moses of Chorene, l. ii. c. 78.—89. *"

But it is c. 83. which contains the particular account †.

XXIII.

Our author says, "It appears, however, that about forty years afterwards, the Emperor Valerian was persuaded of the truth of this assertion, since in one of his rescripts he evidently supposes, that Senators, Roman knights, and ladies of quality, were engaged in the Christian sects ‡." In confirmation of this he appeals to Cyprian, epist. 79. §

* Note 176. c. xv.

† 4to edit. Whiston. Lond. 1736.

‡ Page 515.

§ Note 188. c. xv.

But

But epistle 79th, in *Fell's* edition*, is addressed "to Cyprian from Felix Jader, Polianus," &c. and in *Pamplius's* edition, from *Lucius*; yet no mention is made in the 79th epistle of either of these editions, of "Senators, Roman knights, or ladies of quality, who were engaged in the Christian sects."

XXIV.

Mr. G. refers us to "Acta Concil. Carthag. apud Cyprian. Edit. Fell. p. 158.†" Yet in *Fell's* edition of Cyprian's works these acts occur at c. 1. p. 229.‡

XXV.

He says, "See the sharp epistle from Firmilianus bishop of Cæsarea to Stephen bishop of Rome." Ap. Cyprian. epist. 75. §

In *Fell's* edition, this epistle is addressed to Cyprian. ||

XXVI.

He quotes also Cyprian's treatise de Unitate Ecclesiæ, p. 75.—86. **: but in *Fell's* edition it is contained p. 104.—111.

* As Mr. G. has particularly quoted *FELL's* edition of Cyprian's work, and specified no other, it is but reasonable to expect his references to be adjusted to it; but, on the contrary, we find those disagreements which I here mention.

† Note 113. c. xv.

‡ "Per Joannem Oxoniensem Episcopum; & Annales Cyprianici per Joannem Cestriensem."

§ Note 123. c. xv.

|| The title is, "Firmilianus Cypriano fratri in Domino salutem."

** Note 115. c. xv.

XXVII.

XXVII.

Again he refers to "Cyprian de Lapsis" p. 87.—98. edit. *Fell**: Now in this very edition the treatise is from p. 129. to 131.

I might have noticed many other inaccurate references of this kind, but I really am afraid lest I should have already wearied out my reader's patience in such minute remarks: The whole, *collectively* considered, must give evident proofs that, had our author consulted the original materials, he could not have made so many mistakes. And though these several instances, considered in a *separate* view, appear trivial and minute, like the *scattered* beams of the sun, diffusing warmth with a benignant but *less sensible* influence; yet, when the many proofs are considered as composing a *great body*, like the same rays, *collected in a focus*, they make us instantly *sensible* of their *great power and effect*.

I should now proceed to my third charge of plagiarism; but as I have some other observations to make, which could not well be reduced under any distinct head, I beg leave to lay them before my reader at this place.

Though our historian descants upon "*the universal toleration of polytheism*," with the utmost exertion of his florid pen †; yet his assertions are frequently *inconsistent* ‡.

* Note 89. c. xvi.

† These arguments of Mr. G. are opposed and confuted by D. Watson in his Apology (letter vi. p. 171, &c.) and by the Author of the Remarks (p. 47, &c.) who truly observes, that, "these pages of our author's disquisitions, (in c. xvi.) while they treat of the conduct of the Roman government towards the Christians, contain in reality a *laboured apology* for it, rather than a *disinterested relation* of mere facts," &c.

‡ See a particular instance noted by Dr. Watson, Apology, p. 188.

He tells us, that "the Jews, and *Christians* also, *justly* forfeited the rights of toleration by their inflexible zeal for their religions; and by refusing the accustomed tribute of indulgence to Polytheism *." Yet he himself speaks of "the *benevolent*, the *innocent*, the *inoffensive* mode of the Christian faith and worship, and extols them as the friends human kind †."

In one place, our author speaks of "the *reverence* of the Roman princes and governors for "the temple of Jerusalem, &c. ‡"

But what a *different* strain is this, from what we meet with at the beginning of the 15th chapter: "According to the maxims of universal toleration; "the Romans protected a *superstition* (that is, the "Jewish) which *they despised* §."

And though he adds, "the polite Augustus "condescended to give orders, that sacrifices should "be offered for his prosperity in the temple of Jerusalem:" Yet we find a contrast in his note on this very passage. "Augustus left a foundation "for a perpetual sacrifice: Yet *he approved of the* "neglect his grandson Caius expressed towards the "temple of Jerusalem ¶."

* The same author has refuted Mr. G.'s favourite reason, which he assigns for the cause of the persecutions, namely, that as "the rights of toleration were held by mutual indulgence: they were *justly* forfeited by a refusal of the accustomed tribute, which the Jews first, and the Christians afterward, inflexibly refused."

This his argument teaches us what the *humane* toleration of Polytheism was; to *persecute* all those who were of a different persuasion.

† Page 519. 537.

‡ Page 521.

§ Page 451.

¶ Note 6. c. xv.

M

In

In order to extricate himself from the difficulties with which he is embarrassed in endeavouring to give a specious pretext for the *polite* Romans having persecuted the Christians; Mr. Gibbon has made use of an argument, not only inconsistent with the avowed principles of *free-thinking*, but even with those of the *reformation*. “*It was incumbent on them,*” says he, “*to persevere in the sacred institutions of their ancestors:* By embracing the faith of the Gospel, the Christians had incurred the supposed guilt of an *unnatural and unpardonable offence*. They dissolved the *sacred ties* of custom and education, *violated* the religious institutions of their country, and *presumptuously despised whatever their fathers had believed as true, or had revered as sacred* *.” These are the weak arguments which popery so strenuously urged to maintain its establishment. The *validity* of which, had our forefathers acknowledged, we had still languished under its yoke; nor ever tasted the sweets of our glorious liberty in church and state. No wonder after this, that Mr. G. should speak of a possibility, that “*circumstances could authorize religious persecutions by the most specious arguments of political justice and public safety* †.”

I cannot

* Page 523.

† As our author, with a view to prejudice Christianity, represents it as *necessarily* containing something *very criminal*, that it could compel the *polite* and *humane* people of Rome to persecute those who professed it, I shall obviate any such suspicion in the words of Mosheim.

“*Qui hodie Christianæ religionis divinitatem oppugnant, uti avide captant omnia quæ suspicionis aliquid gignere in mentibus imperitorum possunt: ita etiam Romanorum erga Christianos odium adhibent ad invidiam religioni Christianæ creandam. Sapientissimus, aiunt, qui post orbem conditum fuit,*
“*populus,*

I cannot help observing that *unfeelingness* which Mr. G. shews, though not without the greatest inconsistency, whenever he has occasion to speak of the sufferings of the persecuted Christians. That we may be more convinced of this, I have collected his sentiments on the subject dispersed through his work.

Though he himself admits the *scandalous* accusations raised against the Christians to be *unjust* and *malicious**; yet he enlarges on the topic with an apparent pleasure; and talks, with satisfaction, of their "*deserved infamy, and just punishment*†." Unmoved with compassion, he relates the horrid persecutions raised against the Christians in obedience to the *popular clamours*, which "*doomed them to the severest tortures*:" Yet our author, unknowing how to feel for Christian woe, "*APPLAUDS the humanity of the Roman magistrates, and the excessive lenity of the governors, who, usually, were inclined to gratify the inclinations of a licentious people, by whom the voice of compassion was not heard; and to appease the rage of an exasperated populace, by the sacrifice of a few obnoxious victims*." These obnoxious victims were the *Christians*; *obnoxious*, because "*they abhorred the false gods of mankind*," (that is, the idols of Rome) "*and by their ab-*

"populus, idemque humanissimus, nullique mortalium religionis nomine molestus, Christianam tamen religionem unam salutis publicæ noxiam judicabat & ferre nolebat. Ex hoc rectissime effeceris, fuisse in primis Christianis vitia & maculas tranquillitati ac saluti civitatis magnum periculum & perniciem minantes. Qui tam inique suspicantur, suam ipsi produunt insidiam, veterumque rerum Romanarum se ignaros ostendunt." Hist. Christ. sæc. i. § 27. p. 101.

* Page 526—529.

† Page 533, 534.

“ sence and melancholy on these solemn festivals,
 “ seemed to *insult* or *lament* the public felicity *.”

These he elsewhere calls “ *elegant* ceremonies
 “ and *innocent* devotion †.” While every one, the
 least versed in pagan mythology, cannot be igno-
 rant of their *profane* ceremonies and *obscene* devo-
 tion ; and even Mr. G. acknowledges, that “ they
 “ contributed to extinguish humanity.”

What a medley of inconsistent reflections have
 we here in the very words of our author ? How
 hostile a disposition does he discover to Christiani-
 ty ? What feeling person but must express astonish-
 ment, to find such cruel proceedings dignified with
 the title of *humanity* ?

I might insist on the *impropriety*, nay *falsity* of
 his expression, that “ *the Christian religion grew up*
 “ *in silence and obscurity* ‡.” This is by no means
 consonant to the received opinion of mankind,
 both Jews and Gentiles. It is certain, on the con-
 trary, that this religion made every possible noise
 in the world that its nature would admit of. We
 see the whole nation of the Jews in commotion in
 its infant state, and the Gentile powers shortly
 after united against it. So that we may say, in the
 words of the royal Psalmist, which probably were
 dictated by inspiration, with a prophetic and se-
 condary view to this great event : “ The kings of
 “ the earth set themselves, and the rulers take
 “ counsel together, against the Lord, and against
 “ his anointed §.”

* Page 542, 543.

† Page 464—466.

‡ C. xv. p. 449.

§ Psalm ii. 2.

See Dr. Horne's comment on this psalm ; and Bishop Atter-
 bury's Sermon I. vol. iii. “ *This thing was not done in a corner.*”
 See also Sermon III. IV. vol. i.

I could

I could oppose his assertion, that " The obligation of preaching to the Gentiles the faith of Moses, had never been inculcated as a precept of the law; and that the Jews were not inclined to impose it on themselves as a voluntary duty * ;" with the sentiment of the learned Le Clerc, who says, that "*the Jews strained every nerve of their ingenuity to recall the heathen from idolatry †.*"

Besides, our Saviour's speech to the Pharisees, " Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte ‡," must surely overthrow this sentiment of Mr. G's. And we may ask, how it happened, that they ever had any proselytes, if this mode of conversion was neglected? For what reason likewise, were the several laws enacted by God, respecting the *stranger* and *proselyte*, if he and his people were so *indifferent*, as Mr. G. represents them, with respect to admitting the Gentiles into covenant with him? Yet it cannot be denied, that the whole Mosaic law abounds with such precepts. We may, therefore, safely conclude, that the "*Jews did really preach the faith of Moses to the Gentiles,*" in hopes of converting them.

I might justly censure our author's having absolutely condemned the passage of Josephus, respecting our Saviour, as " an example of no vulgar forgery §," because many learned and judicious

* Page 453.

† " Cum is esset gentis Judaicæ status, multa poterant Judæi o jici ab Ethnicis, quibus agere respondebant; unde sine dubio fierat, ut pauciores multo proselytas ad se adicere possent. licet omnes ingenii nervos ad Ethnicos ab idololatria revocandos intenderent." Le Clerc, Prælegom. c. vii. § 1.

‡ St. Matt. xxiii. 15,

§ Note 35. c. xvi.

persons acknowledge its authenticity *. And though we should allow it to be an interpolation, in compliance to the judgment of some great critics; yet the ingenious and able *Bullet* has assigned very sufficient reasons, which might have induced Josephus not to mention this well-known fact †; and

* See what may be advanced in favour of this passage, set forth in a learned and ingenious manner, in a late publication entitled "*Vindicia Flaviana*."

† The original is written in French; I have extracted the translation of the particular passage.

" This historian (Josephus) either believed, that the whole account of Jesus's disciples, concerning their master, was false, or he believed that it was true. In the first case, he would not have been silent. Every thing led him to speak on such an occasion; the interest of truth; zeal for his religion, the foundations of which the Christians sapped by their impostures; love of his countrymen, whom the disciples of Jesus accused of having put to death, by a malignant and cruel jealousy, the Messiah, the Son of God. By detecting the imposture of the apostles, Josephus would have covered the enemies of his people with confusion, rendered himself agreeable to his countrymen, conciliated the favour of the emperors, who would fain have stifled Christianity in its birth. He would have engaged the applauses of all those who held this religion in abhorrence, and undeceived those very Christians, whom the first disciples of Jesus had deluded. Now, is it possible to believe, that a man, well acquainted with a cheat, which it is so much his interest to publish, should be so scrupulously and profoundly silent upon it, especially when so natural an occasion offered itself to mention it? If false miracles should be vented among the people, tending to unsettle their faith, with what zeal would our writers labour to detect the imposture, and to prevent their seduction? Would they not think, and with good reason, that silence on such an occasion was a criminal prevarication? It seems evident, therefore, that, if Josephus believed, that what the apostles said of their master was false, he would have taken care to make it known. If he did not believe it to be false, he believed it to be true. And it was nothing, but the fear of displeasing his own nation, the Romans, and the emperor, that stopped his

" mouth;

and has thereby proved, that no disadvantage can result to Christianity from his having passed it over in silence.

I might urge, on the authority of the learned Lardner, the *improbability*, if not *impossibility*, that the Christians, as being called *Galileans*, could be confounded with "the sect of the *Gaulonites* *." Our author's intention in confounding them was manifestly to asperse the character of the first Christians, by supposing them so criminal as to be capable of being mistaken for "*the new and pernicious sect of the Gaulonites.*"

I might observe, that as the Spanish inscription in Gruter, is not so *universally* granted to be false as Mr. G. intimates †; it stands as a proof, that Nero's persecution of the Christians *spread itself from Rome into the provinces, and was authorised by public edicts* ‡.

I might say, with good reason, that Dr. Lardner's suspicions of *bigotry* in Pliny's conduct, seem well grounded §, though our author has censured them ||.

"mouth: In which case, *his silence is as good as his testimony*,
"and equally serves to authenticate the truth of the fact, upon
"which Christianity is founded." *History of the Establishment of Christianity.*

* I have before quoted the passage from Lardner.

† Note 42. c. xvi, Gruter, p. 338. N^o. 9.

‡ Dr. Lardner, though he allows the inscription to have been esteemed as false by some persons, and nor without probable reasons; yet seems to argue the point with great desire to establish its authenticity: And asserts, on the authority of Tertullian, Lactantius, and Sulpicius Severus, the *universality* of Nero's persecution, in the words I have quoted from him. Vol. i. c. iii. *Heathen Testimonies*, p. 336, &c.

§ Vol. ii. c. ix. *Testimonies*, p. 45, 46.

|| Note 56. c. xvi.

I might justify Mosheim in his refinement, as Mr. G. is pleased to style it *, on the worship of Alexander Severus, by conclusive arguments †.

I might assert, that our author, by adhering too strictly to the sentiment of Dodwell, has greatly diminished the real number of martyrs : The candid Mosheim seems to fix the proper boundary between legendary fiction and sceptical diffidence ‡.

I might ask, on what authority our author informs us, that “ both Dr. Burnet and Mr. Moyle “ were unacquainted with the passage in Chrysostom,” which he quotes § ? This I know, that Burnet ||; and, if I remember right, Moyle likewise, refers to it. I am, therefore, more inclined to think that Mr. G. is *only* acquainted with the passage in Chrysostom from their reference and quotation; which suspicion receives a great degree of probability, from his having made such a gross blunder, in quoting one edition of Chrysostom, while his references answer to another.

* Note 115. c. xvi.

† Mosheim, de rebus Christian. ante Constantin. M. sæc. iii. § 8. p. 464, 465.

‡ I shall briefly extract the particular passage.

“ Postquam vero *H. Dodwellus* veterem hanc sententiam infirmare ausus est, *multi extiterunt, qui paucos tantum extremo supplicio ob Christianam religionem affectos esse, cum ipso adserarunt* : Quibus alii vehementer tamquam divinæ virtutis obiectatoribus resistunt. *Mediam* inter oppositas has sententias *viam* qui tenent, illi propius a veritate remoti videntur. Non tot sunt, quot olim numerabantur, & hodie a multis adhuc numerantur : At *plures etiam sunt, quam Dodwellus* § *amici ejus putant,*” &c. Sæc. i. pars i. c. v. § 11. Institut. Hist. Eccles.

§ Note 168. c. xv.

|| Burnet's Travels into Italy.

I might

I might ask, in what respect Christianity had corrupted *the purity* of Roman manners?

This system of love and benevolence (which even Mr. G. allows it to be) might indeed have humanized the brutal ferocity which distinguished the *purity* of Roman manners; and might have taught the heart of Decius to pity and redress the cruel treatment of the Christians.

But why is it *more reasonable* to believe, that “Decius, in the prosecution of his general design to *restore the purity* of Roman manners, was desirous of *delivering* the empire from what he condemned as *a recent and criminal superstition* ;” than to believe “that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor *?” Surely, if “his virtues will scarcely allow us to suspect” the latter; his being actuated by the former motive, will bring his virtues themselves into suspicion.

I could prove, that Mr. G., like *Rousseau*, one of his famous predecessors in infidelity, while he *hypocritically* launches out in the praises of revelation, and *affects* to treat it with reverence and esteem; really endeavours to expose and place it in a ridiculous light. For he represents it as springing up at a time when “the weakness of *polytheism*, being fully exposed and exploded by the scepticism of the pagans;” “the *fall* of this “system of mythology would probably have been “succeeded by the introduction of *some other mode of superstition* :—if, in the decisive moment, the “wisdom of *Providence* had not interposed a genuine revelation, fitted to inspire the most rational esteem and conviction; whilst, at the same “time, it was adorned with all that could attract

“ the attention, the wonder, and the veneration of the people *.”

From the words of Mr. G. one would think, that *the mode of Christian superstition casually* sprung up in a lucky moment, and succeeded of course to the drooping mythology of paganism; and that the essence of Christianity consisted in the performance of numerous rites and ceremonies in superb temples, to attract the wonder of the gazing croud.

Observe also, with what impious disrespect he speaks of the Mosaic law: “ *The law of Moses might be for the most part frivolous or absurd †.*”

Though I entirely agree with our author “ that the conquests of Rome prepared and facilitated those of Christianity; ‡ ” yet I might easily confute his assertion, that “ the Christian missionaries did not encounter any of the obstacles which

* Page 502—505. † Page 523. ‡ Page 505.

The Christian may hence learn to admire and adore the all-seeing and all-powerful ways of Providence: that God should thus employ the secondary means of weak men, without their intent, to facilitate the progress of his religion. Our elegant historian, Dr. Robertson, has described, in most nervous and graceful language, the manner in which the *union and tranquillity* of the Roman empire conducted to the rapid progress of Christianity. “ The noblest people,” says he, “ that ever entered upon the stage of the world, appear to have been only instruments in the divine hand, for the execution of wise purposes, concealed from themselves. The Roman ambition and bravery paved the way, and prepared the world for, the reception of the Christian doctrine. They fought and conquered, that it might triumph with the greater ease. *Howbeit they meant not so, neither did their hearts think so: But it was in their heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few.* Isaiah x. 7.”

See his Sermon “ On the Situation of the World at Christ's Appearance, p. 13, &c.”

“ usually

“ usually retard or prevent the introduction of a
 “ foreign religion into a distant country.” He
 talks of the great service of the Roman highways,
 as opening an easy passage for the propagators of
 Christianity; as if the inconveniencies and imped-
 iments of *travelling* were the *only* obstacles they had
 to surmount. And yet he himself relates those
dreadful persecutions which must cause other breasts
 to heave with the commiserating sigh; and speaks
 of such *severe punishments* which they suffered, that
 from other eyes must draw the sympathetic tear.

I might refute his whole plan of accounting for
 “ the rise and progress of Christianity from secondary
 “ causes,” in the words of another eminent writer,
 whose conversion does as much honour to Christi-
 anity, as his candid avowal of it does to his
 heart. “ The propagation of this religion,” says
 he, “ was not less extraordinary, than the religion
 “ itself; nor less above the reach of all human
 “ power, than the discovery of it was above that
 “ of all human understanding *.”

I might expatiate at large on each of these, and
 on several other topics; but my reader will, I hope,
 excuse my having thus cursorily mentioned them;
 it not being my object, in this *examination*, to
 attack our author upon his principles, but to con-
 vict him of unfairness in his method of supporting
 them.

If, in spite of the numerous instances of *misquo-*
tation and *inaccuracy*, which I have produced, it
 be possible for any one still to credit the boast of
 Mr. Gibbon, that *he has consulted all the original*
materials; to put the matter beyond all doubt, I
 proceed now to shew within how narrow a circle

* Mr. Soame Jenyns.—Internal Evidence of the Christian
 Religion, p. 101, and 104.

his

his erudition, however pompously displayed, is confined. This will be easily done, by laying before my reader, extracts from a *few modern writers*; from which it will appear evident, even to a demonstration, that our historian has not only the same chain of *thoughts*, but often that his very *expressions* are borrowed: And a single glance of the eye will convince us, that his pompous quotations of the Fathers, and other learned authors of antiquity, are but transcribed from the marginal references of these writers.

My reader may, perhaps, be surprised that I should mention a *similarity of thoughts* as a proof of *plagiarism*: But if we consider that Mr. G.'s talents shine most conspicuously in the elegance of language, we must naturally imagine, that he would not constantly adopt *the very words* of the author, as he could so easily set off the sentiments in new and more graceful expressions, which would, at the same time, serve to disguise the plagiarism*. Besides, it being my intent to prove to the Christian world, that our author has, in fact, produced *no new* objections against our religion, and that his boasted attack is made with arguments and reflexions long ago exploded; to convict him of a *similarity of sentiment* fully answers this purpose.

I proceed now to the proof of my charge; and, for the sake of the English reader, shall begin with *Dr. Middleton*.

Instances of PLAGIARISM.

When I gave an instance of Mr. G.'s misrepresentation of Irenæus, I promised to inform my read-

* The sentences and expressions which Mr. G. has more closely copied, are distinguished by *Italics*: To which, if my reader directs his eye, he will be instantly sensible of the plagiarism.

er how he was betrayed into it: Without consulting the Father, he had contented himself with the representation of *Middleton*; who was not himself very remarkable for accuracy of quotation, as *Dr. Pearce* has demonstrated †.

MIDDLETON says,

The Words of
Mr. GIBBON are,

I.

“ *Irenæus, however, declares it (the gift of foreign languages) frequently communicated to have been indulged to many in his days. But Irenæus, though Irenæus it is very remarkable, himself was left to struggle with the difficulties of a BARBAROUS DIALECT, that this primitive bishop, who ascribes it so liberally to others, appears whilst he preached the to have been in great Gospel to the natives of want of it himself, for Gaul*.*”

the propagation of the Gospel in his own diocese, among the *Celtæ* or *Gauls*; where, as *Dr. Cave* interprets his words, “ it was not the least part of his trouble, that he was forced to learn the language of the country, a rude and

† See his two replies to *Dr. Middleton's* letter to *Dr. Waterland*.

* P. 475. Our author, in a note, makes an observation with respect to these words of *Middleton*, though he is far from acknowledging that he borrowed any thought from him; hoping, no doubt, by this indirect method, to which he frequently has recourse, to evade the accusation of being a plagiarist.

His words are, “ *Dr. Middleton* (*Free Inquiry*, p. 96. &c.) observes, that as this pretension of all others was the most difficult to support by art, it was the soonest given up. The observation suits his hypothesis.” Note 72. c. xv.

“ *bar-*

"barbarous dialect, before he could do any good upon them†."

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

II.

"As to the first, and principal indeed of all miracles, that of raising the dead; it was frequently performed, as Irenæus affirms, on necessary occasions; and men, so raised, had lived afterwards among them many years, &c. Irenæus, l. ii. 56*.

In the very same age, when one Autolytus, an eminent heathen, challenged his friend Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, a convert and champion of the Gospel, to shew him but one person who had

"In the days of Irenæus, about the end of the second century, the resurrection of the dead was very far from being esteemed an uncommon event; that the miracle was frequently performed on necessary occasions, by great fasting, and the joint supplication of the church of the place, and the persons thus restored to their prayers, had lived afterwards among them many years‡. Irenæus, l. ii. 56, 57. l. v. c. 6. At such a period, when faith

† Vol. i. p. 245. 246. 8vo edit.

* I here mean to point out to my reader the false grounds on which Dr. Middleton, and his servile transcriber Mr. Gibbon, build this presumptuous assertion. The words of Irenæus do not give them authority to say that, IN HIS DAYS, the resurrection of the dead was frequently performed on necessary occasions. The Father speaks of this, and other miracles, as having been done in times past. Our author, in thus taking for granted the assertion of Middleton, has been as greatly deceived, as the credulous traveller who pursues an *Ignis Fatuus* as his guide. But I need not enlarge on this matter, for the fallacious argument of the *Free-Inquirer* has been long ago totally refuted and exploded, by Dr. Fortin, in his "Remarks on Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii. p. 14, &c. And by Dr. Douglas in his *Criterion*, p. 374, &c.

‡ Note 75. c. xv.

MIDDLETON.

had been raised from the dead, on the condition of turning Christian himself upon it; Theophilus discovers by his answer, that he was not able to give him that satisfaction*. Theoph. ad Autol. l. i. p. 77.

whole controversy, and promised Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, that if he could be gratified with the sight of a single person, who had been actually raised from the dead, he would immediately embrace the Christian religion. It is somewhat remarkable, that the prelate of the first eastern church, however anxious for the conversion of his friend, thought proper to decline this fair and reasonable challenge†. Theophilus ad Antiochum, lib. ii. p. 77†.

Mr. Dodwell, however, from this single authority of Irenæus asserts the miraculous powers of the second century to be superior even to those of the first. Dissert. ii. in Iren. § 42. p. 165||.

GIBBON.

faith could boast of so many wonderful victories over death, it seems difficult to account for the scepticism of those philosophers, who still rejected and derided the doctrine of the resurrection. A noble Græcian had rested on this important ground the century was still more fertile in miracles than the first §." Dissert. ad Irenæum, ii. 42.

* Page 197.

† Page 476.

‡ I have already observed how inaccurately Mr. G. has here transcribed.

|| Page 197.

§ Note 75. c. xv.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

III.

“ The whole system of pagan idolatry was believed by the Fathers to have been managed by the craft and agency of dæmons,—for the sake of deluding and destroying mankind. They imagined them to *assume the names*, and to act the parts of, the heathen gods†: Vagrant jugglers imposed the tricks of their art as *the effects of supernatural power*, on a multitude already persuaded that *they lived on magic ground*, exposed at every step to snares and charms, contrived by *malicious spirits perpetually haunting them* *, &c.

“ It was the universal sentiment; both of the church and of heretics, that the dæmons were the authors, the patrons, and the objects of idolatry. That they were still permitted to roam upon earth, to torment the bodies, and to seduce the minds of sinful men; that they had distributed among themselves the most important characters of polytheism, one dæmon *assuming the name* and attributes of Jupiter, another of Æsculapius, &c. §

The most curious, or the most credulous, among the pagans, were often persuaded to enter into a *society which assert-*

ed an actual claim of miraculous powers. The primitive Christians perpetually *trod on mystic ground*, and their minds were exercised by the habits of believing the most extraordinary events. They felt, or they fancied, that on every side *they were incessantly assaulted by dæmons*, comforted by visions, &c.

“ When pious Christians are arrived to this pitch

“ The real or imaginary prodigies, of which they

† Page 194.

§ Page 463.

• Page 195.

MIDDLETON.

pitch of credulity,—their very piety will oblige them to admit as miraculous whatever is pretended to be wrought in defence of the Gospel, and so make them of course the implicit dupes of their own wonder-workers*.”

GIBBON.

they so frequently believed themselves to be the objects, the instruments, or the spectators, very happily disposed *them to adopt* with the same ease, but with far greater justice, the authentic wonders of the evangelic history, &c.”†

IV.

“*Justin Martyr frequently appeals to what every one might see with his own eyes, in every part of the world, and particularly in Rome, in the case of persons possessed with devils; who were cured and set free, and the devils themselves baffled and driven away by the Christians, adjuring or exorcising them in the name of Jesus, when all other exorcists and incanters had tried in vain to help them †.*

Tertullian challenges the heathen magistrates to call before their tribunals, any person possessed

“*The expulsion of the demons from the bodies of those unhappy persons whom they had been permitted to torment, was considered as a signal though ordinary triumph of religion, and is repeatedly alleged by the ancient apologists as the most convincing evidence of the truth of Christianity. The awful ceremony was usually performed in a public manner, and in the presence of a great number of spectators; the patient was relieved by the power or skill of the exorcist, and the vanquished demon was heard to*

* Page 195.

† Page 131.

† Page 478.

MIDDLETON.

essed with a devil : and if the evil spirit, when exorcised by any Christian whatsoever, did not own himself to be a devil, as truly, as in other places, he would falsely call himself a god, not daring to tell a lie to a Christian, that then they should take the life of that Christian : and *what is more manifest, adds he, than this operation ; what more convincing than this proof ?* Apolog. c. 23."

GIBBON.

to confess that he was one of the fabled gods of antiquity, who had impiously usurped the adoration of mankind†.

Tertullian throws out a bold defiance to the pagan magistrates‡. And again, Tertullian alleges the confession of the dæmons themselves as often as they were tormented by the exorcists§. Apolog. c. 23."

V.

" Irenæus asserts likewise the doctrine of the Millennium, in the grossest sense of it, &c.—Papias, a disciple of St. John, and companion of Polycarp, an ancient man, testifies, &c. || Irenæus, l. v. p. 455.

Irenæus then proceeds to confirm this doctrine by the testimonies of the prophets,

" One of the grossest images, respecting the Millennium, may be found in Irenæus, the disciple of Papias, who had seen the apostle St. John. Irenæus, l. v. p. 455.

Most of these pictures were borrowed from a misrepresentation of Isaiah, Daniel,

* Page 133.

† Note 74. c. xv.

|| Page 169.

‡ Page 475.

§ Note 38. c. 15.

MIDDLETON.

prophets, *Isaiab, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Revelations of St. John, &c.*

Justin declares, that all the Christians, who were in all points orthodox, embraced and believed the doctrine of the Millennium;--and was followed in it by the Fathers of the second and third centuries: Yet the doctrine itself was afterwards exploded, as it well deserved, not only as absurd and monstrous, but as impious and heretical †. Justin. Dial. par. ii. p. 313.

In all which, these two Fathers, whose principles I have been illustrating, were implicitly followed, for a century or two at least, by all their successors ‡".

GIBBON.

Daniel, and the Apocalypse.*

The assurance of a Millennium, was carefully inculcated by a succession of the Fathers from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, who conversed with the immediate disciples of the apostles, down to Lactantius, who was preceptor to the son of Constantine. The doctrine of Christ's reign upon earth, was at first treated as a profound allegory, was considered by degrees, as a doubtful and useless opinion, and was at length rejected as the absurd invention of heresy and fanaticism §. Justin. Dial. ii. ||.

VI.

Mr. G. finds a passage extracted from Tertullian by Middleton, which he does not hesitate to translate and put in his text.

* Note 62. c. xv.

† Page 153.

‡ Page 179.

§ Page 471.

|| Note 63. c. xv.

MIDDLETON.

"*Si Tiberis ascendit ad mania; si Nilus non ascendit in arva; si cælum stetit; terra movit; si fames; si lues; statim, Christianos ad Leonem*".
Tertull. Apol. 40."

GIBSON.

"If the empire had been afflicted by any recent calamity, by a plague, a famine, or an unsuccessful war; if the Tiber had, or if the Nile had not, risen beyond its banks; if the earth had shaken, or if the temperate order of the seasons had been interrupted, &c. Tertull. Apol. 40†."

VII.

"The divine censure does not cease to chastise us, neither by night, nor by day; for, besides nightly visions, even boys among us are filled with the Holy Ghost †."

See also his words, that "the power of working miracles, was upon their pretended revival, committed not to the bishops, the martyrs, &c. but to boys, to women, and to private and obscure laymen §."

"In one of the dialogues, commonly ascribed to Lucian, the Christians seem to be
"ridi-

"The divine inspiration, whether it was conveyed in the form of a waking or of a sleeping vision, is described as a favour very liberally bestowed on all ranks of the faithful, on women as on elders, on boys as well as upon bishops §."

"When their devout minds were sufficiently prepared by a course of prayer, of fasting, and
"of

* See p. 326, 327.

† Page 222.

‡ P. 542. note 60. c. xvi.

§ P. 475. || Page 146.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

“ridiculed, on account “of vigils, to receive the
 “of their fasting, and “extraordinary impulse,
 “watching whole nights “they were transported out
 “in hymns and prayers, “of their senses, and deli-
 “as if they could infuse, “vered in ecstasy what
 “by that means, what “was inspired, being
 “sort of dreams or vi- “mere organs of the holy
 “sions they “thought “spirit, just as a pipe or
 “fit.” “flute is of him who blows

Athenagoras expressly “into it. Athenagoras in
 says, “that while they were “Legatione †.”
 “under the divine im-
 “pulse, they were trans-
 “ported out of their senses, and delivered in ecstasy
 “what was inspired, being mere organs of the
 “holy spirit, just as a pipe or flute is of him
 “who blows into it.” Athenagoras Legat. pro
 Christian. §”

Besides this we have the following remarkable coincidence of reference :

Middleton says, at this place, “Justin Martyr
 “speaks of them in the same strain,” &c. *Cohort.
 ad Gent.*—“Tertullian also,” &c. *Adv. Marcion.* l. iv.

These quotations Gibbon has accurately transcribed
 into his note 73. c. xv. “Justin Martyr, co-
 “hort. ad Gentes. Tertullian, adv. Marcion.
 “l. iv.”

Now what shall we say? Is it probable, I may
 add is it possible, that two persons could translate

* Page 234.

§ Page 237.

† Page 475. note 73. c. xv.

the original Greek so as to answer *verbatim et literatim* in this manner? It is obvious that the above passage was extracted by Mr. G. from Middleton; there is not a single reference but he affords it to him. And though our author does make an observation on Cicero, in a note on this place, we need only turn back a few pages in Middleton, and there we meet with the same thought, and the same reference,

MIDDLETON.

“ From these testimonies we may collect, that the *prophecy* of the primitive church by *vision* or *ecstasy*, was of the same kind, as to its outward appearance, with *that divination by fury*, as it was called among the Gentiles, &c. of which Cicero says, in way of raillery, “ what authority can *that madness have, which you call divine*,” &c. De Div. ii. 54. †”

GIBBON.

“ These descriptions “ are not very unlike “ the prophetic fury, for “ which Cicero expresses “ so little reverence *.” De Divin. ii. 54.

VIII.

It was highly incumbent on Mr. Gibbon to say, that “ the learning of *Dodwell*, and the ingenuity “ of Middleton, have left scarcely any thing to “ add concerning the merit, the honours, and the “ motives of the martyrs †.” For if we compare these authors together, we shall find that Mr. G. has not advanced a single thought of his own on

† P. 223, 224.

* Note 73. c. xv.

† Note 89. c. xvi.

the subject. See Middleton, page 332. sect. 3.
See Gibbon, page 550, 551.

IX.

MIDDLETON.

Middleton speaks of *Cyprian's heavenly visions*, of his flight and retreat from persecution; that it gave great scandal, especially to some, as appears by the epistle of the clergy of Rome, on this occasion, to the clergy of Carthage; and that it is no wonder to find Cyprian and his apologist Pontius so solicitous to excuse it*.

"Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria," says he, "has said, that in the time of persecution, he was commanded by God in a vision to retire from Alexandria, and was wonderfully preserved by him in his retreat†." Cyprian. Epist. 2. 9. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 40.

GIBBON.

Gibbon says, "Prudence suggested the necessity of a temporary retreat to Cyprian; that his extreme caution did not escape the censure of the more rigid Christians;" and appeals to the polite, but severe, epistle of the clergy of Rome to the bishop of Carthage."

He says also, that Pontius labours with the greatest care and diligence, to justify his master against the general censure‡." Cyprian. Epist. 8, 9.

Mr. G. says, that "the example of several holy bishops, and the divine admonitions which, as Cyprian declares himself, he frequently received in visions and ecstasies, were the reasons alleged

* Page 227.

† Page 230.

‡ Note 76. c. xvi.

in his justification *." He appeals, in a note, to the examples of Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neo Cæsarea §. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi, c. 40, &c.

X.

Compare what M. says on the Galileans, page 332,—and what G. says of them, p. 536, 537.

XI.

MIDDLETON,

GIBBON.

M. says, "None of these venerable saints have any where affirmed, that they themselves were endued with any power of working miracles," &c. †

G. asks, "Does there exist a single instance of a saint asserting, that he himself possessed the gift of miracles?" &c. †

XII.

Middleton speaking of the Sibylan books, says, "These forged books are frequently cited and applied to the defence of Christianity, by the most eminent Fathers, as true and genuine pieces, and of equal authority with the Scriptures themselves **."

Mr. G. speaking of these spurious books, says, almost in Middleton's words, "These *pious forgeries* were *obtruded* on the Gentiles as of equal value with the genuine inspirations of heaven ||."

* Page 547.

§ Note 77. c. xvi.

† See page 143.

† See p. 477. note 79. c. xv.

** Page 74.

|| Page 517.

Compare

Compare also p. 155. 157.—with note 191.
c. xv.

XIII.

See what M. says of the cure of the emperor Severus by holy oil, &c. Tertullian. ad Scapulam, c. 4. *—And what G. says of healing the sick by the use of oil; and of this cure by Proculus†. Mr. G. also appeals to the epistle of Tertullian to Scapula ‡.

XIV.

Compare what is said by Dr. M. of the Christians challenging the miraculous powers maintained in the heathen world, p. 201, 202.—and what our author says of the supernatural powers assumed by the church, p. 565. See also his notes 137, 138. c. xvi. of the cures performed at the shrine of Æsculapius.

XV.

Examine what M. says of the progress of the Gospel among the vulgar, and its gaining some few of rank, &c. p. 324, 325.—Also what G. says of the reception it met with among the higher class of people, &c. p. 513—517.

Compare M.'s remark on the words of Suetonius at this place, and his reference to Sueton. in Ner. c. 16.—with the similar remark of G., p. 534. and quotation of Sueton. in Nerone, c. 16. See note 54. c. xvi.

* Page 200.

† Page 557.

‡ Note 197. c. xvi.

XVI. MID-

XVI.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

Translates Tacitus, as saying, that "the Christians were condemned *not so much* for their *supposed crime of setting fire to the city*, as for *their* hatred of all mankind : and though *they deserved the most exemplary punishment*," &c. Taciti Annales xv. 44. *

Observe the similarity in G.'s translation, of the same passage, "Their *guilt deserved the most exemplary punishment* ; they were convicted *not so much for the crime of setting fire to the city*, as for their hatred of human-kind." Tacit.† annal. xv. 44.

XVII.

See what is said by Dr. M. on Pliny and his conduct, p. 325. where he cites Plin. Ep. x. 97. —Compare with this our author's words and reference, p. 540. Plin. Ep. x. 97. ‡

XVIII.

Compare what is said in the Free Inquiry, p. 326, 327.—and what we meet with in G. p. 513. 528.

See M. p. 225.—and G. p. 465.

XIX.

See the observation of M. on Tertullian, respecting *flight in persecution*, p. 344.—and the note of G. on this occasion, note 99. c. xvi.

* Page 324, 325.

† Page 533, 534.

‡ Note 56. c. xvi.

XX. Compare

XX.

Compare what is said of the *Astetics*, in Middleton's preface, p. 20.—with what G. says of their origin, &c. p. 485. and note 97. c. xv.

XXI.

MIDDLETON.

GIBBON.

See the remarks of this author on the period to which miracles are to be extended*. That "each succeeding age "furnishes miracles and "witnesses," &c. that one "supplies a venerable Bede, whose "very name carries authority," &c. †

Observe what G. says of this period, that "every age bears testimony to wonderful events, &c. till we are led on to accuse our own inconsistency, if we deny to the venerable Bede, or to the holy Bernard, the same degree of confidence we had so liberally granted to Justin and Irenæus."

XXII.

Compare the remark of Middleton on Lucian. de Mort. Peregrin. p. 144,—and the words of G. p. 481. and note 84. c. xv.

XXIII.

Observe the remark on the Epistles of Ignatius, Middleton, p. 125, 126. and note 1.—and what Gibbon says of them, p. 552. note 92. c. xvi.

* Page 61. Introd. Discourse.

† Page 71, *ibid.* See also vol. ii. p. 59.

XXIV.

XXIV.

See where M. largely dwells on the *purity* of the first ages, p. 74. 76. 79. 80.—See at the same time what G. says of the *virgin purity* of the church, &c. p. 461. 477. 564.

XXV.

MIDDLETON.

Middleton says of the reproach of Celsus; "These artful pretenders, by insinuating themselves chiefly in private houses, or among the ignorant populace, had been able to maintain their ground †," &c. p. 79.

And again, "Celsus," says he, "represents all the Christian workers as mere vagabonds and common cheats, who rambled about to play their tricks at fairs and markets, not in the circles of the wiser and better sort, for among

such they never ventured to appear; but wherever they observed a set of raw young fellows, slaves or fools, there they took care to intrude themselves, and display all their arts. Cecilius

GIBBON.

Mr. G. draws the same picture of the Christians. He says, "whilst they

"cautiously avoid the dangerous encounter of philosophers, they mingle with the rude and illiterate croud, and insinuate themselves in to those minds whom their age, their sex, or their education, has the best disposed to receive the impression of religious terrors." He had before said, "These obscure teachers are as mute in public as they are loquacious and dogmatical in private †."

† Orig. con. Cels. l. 1. p. 8, 9.

† Page 514

MIDDLETON.

"also calls them a lurking nation, thunning the
"light, *mute in public*, prating in corners *."

Having given such evident proofs of our author's being greatly indebted to *the Free Inquiry of Dr. Middleton*, we must surely allow, that it was just and grateful in him to speak handsomely of that treatise †. But it would have been still *more just and grateful* in him, if he had *acknowledged where* he had borrowed from him. He has, indeed, sometimes mentioned the name of Middleton; once or twice with an additional remark; but he has never directly owned the assistance he has received from him. We may, however, rest satisfied, that Christianity has little to fear from this fresh attack on *miracles*, when its foe, being stripped of his glittering armour, appears to wield only such weapons as have been already blunted and shattered against its repelling shield.

Instances of Plagiarism from BARBEYRAC.

As our author found the *Free Inquiry* of Middleton very useful to him on the subject of miracles; so, with regard to *the morality of the Fathers*, Barbeyrac's treatise has proved a source of infor-

* Page 144.

† Mr. G. says, (p. 476.) "The miracles of the primitive church, after obtaining the sanction of ages, have been lately attacked in a *very free and ingenious inquiry*, which though it has met with the *most favourable reception* from the public, appears to have excited a general scandal among the divines of our own, as well as of the other Protestant churches of Europe."

†

mation

mation equally fruitful; and, as Barbeyrac has drawn rather a dark and dismal picture of the earliest Christian writers, by selecting and exposing their blemishes; to copy his remarks, in preference to those of other writers less prejudiced on the subject, admirably *suits the purpose* of Mr. Gibbon.

He has indeed, with great propriety, given us a general reference or two to the treatise *De la Morale des Pères*; but as the particular passages which he has fervilely extracted from that work are very numerous, it would have been too humiliating a task to have required of our *diligent and accurate historian, who consults only original materials*, an exact and faithful acknowledgment of all his obligations to the Dutch professor.

I shall introduce the following extracts by observing, that Barbeyrac thus speaks of the origin of the mistaken notions of the Fathers, with regard to the unlawfulness of pleasure; and that our author discovers the same source for their opinions on this subject.

I.

BARBEYRAC.

“ Remontons à la première origine de toutes ces fausses idées.—On se figuroit *les plaisirs les plus naturels, comme aiant quelque chose de mauvais en eux-mêmes*; & la permission, que DIEU donnoit de les goûter, comme
une

GIBBON.

Our devout predecessors, vainly aspiring to imitate the perfections of angels, disdained, or affected to disdain, every earthly and corporeal delight.

The first sensation of pleasure was marked as
the

BARBEYRAC.

GIBBON.

une espèce de *tolerance*, & d'*indulgence*, à laquelle l'*infirmité humaine* l'avoit forcé en quelque manière pour éviter un plus grand mal *."

"De là est née la vie monastique: de là tant d'austeritez & de mortifications inutiles: de là ces voeux de Célibat, si témérairement formez, & qui, étant mal gardez, ont produit tant des désordres," &c. ||

the first moment of their abuse †.

"Such are the early traces of monastic principles and institutions, which, in a subsequent age, have counter-balanced all the temporal advantages of Christianity ‡."

II.

"Les Pères vouloient faire entendre que les secondes & troisièmes nocces ne pouvoient plus avoir une véritable ressemblance au mariage de Jésus-Christ avec son Eglise, qui est le grand modèle des mariages Chrétiens.

"The sensual connexion was refined into a resemblance of the mystic union of Christ with his church, and was pronounced to be indissoluble either by divorce or by death **."

"Que le noeud du mariage soit indissoluble,—le droit canon n'excepte pas même le cas d'adultère, &c. §

* C. iv. sect. 34. 4to edit. Amsterdam, 1728.

† Page 483.

|| Sect. 35.

‡ Page 485.

§ Sect. 36. See also sect. 10.

** Page 484, 485.

BAR-

III.

BARBEYRAC.

"Chacun de nous," dit
ATHENAGORAS, (Legat.
cap. 28.) "ou demeure tel
qu'il est venu au monde,
ou ne se marie qu'une
fois: Car les secondes
noces sont UNE HON-
NETE ADULTERE †."

GIBBON.

"The practice of se-
cond marriages was brand-
ed with the name of adul-
tery §."

IV.

"ATHENAGORAS pré-
tend ailleurs que "le cé-
libat unit d'avantage les
hommes avec Dieu."
Si cela est, comme cha-
cun doit ne rien negli-
ger de ce qui peut entre-
tenir ou augmenter son
union avec Dieu, chacun
devra aussi aspirer au cé-
libat."

"Since desire was im-
puted as a crime, and
marriage was tolerated
as a defect, it was con-
sistent with the same
principles to consider a
state of celibacy as the
nearest approach to the
divine perfection."

† 1. a p. iv. l. 6. p. 29.

§ Page 485. Mr. G. in a note (91. c. xv.) on this place,
says, "See a chain of tradition from Justin Martyr to Jerome, in
the *Morale des Pères*, c. lv. 6—26." Yet willing to make
his reader believe that he had himself consulted the original au-
thors, he transcribes the references of Barbeyrac in the notes
which he subjoins: Thus, for a proof of his assertion that "the
primitive church was filled with a great number of persons of
either sex, who had devoted themselves to the profession of
perpetual chastity," he quotes, at note 93. c. xv. "Athe-
nagoras in Legat. c. 28. Minucius Felix, c. 31. and Justin,"
&c.—In such a general reflection they must all agree, but this
particular part of Athenagoras and of Minucius Felix would have
been more pertinently quoted at note 91. or 89, 90. c. xv.
where Mr. G. introduces the subject on which Barbeyrac has
quoted them. But our author has altered the arrangement, lest
we should discover that he has transcribed these references from
the *Morale des Pères*.

V.

V.

BARBEYRAC.

"Minucius Felix dit,
qu' "un Chrétien ou ne se
"marie jamais, ou ne se
"marie qu'une fois."

Part of his note on
this passage is,

—"Cupiditatem pro-
"creandi aut unam sci-
"mus, aut nullam." c. 31.

GIBBON.

"The primitive church
was filled with a great
number of persons of
either sex, who had
devoted themselves to
the profession of *perpe-
tual chastity.*"

His note is,

"Cupiditatem procre-
andi aut unam scimus, aut
nullam." Minucius Fe-
lix, c. 31, &c.

VI.

"Le chapitre iv. (de
l'ouvrage de CLEMENT
d'Alexandrie, qui a pour
titre le Pédagogue) en-
seigne, comment on peut
se réjouir dans les *Festins*.
CLEMENT en bannit tout
instrument de musique, &
toute chanson*," &c.

"Clement commence
le ii. (livre) par prescrire
la qualité & la quantité
des alimens, dont on doit
user.—Pour ce qui est
de l'usage légitime des
alimens & de la Boisson,
il le borne si fort à ce
que demande la conser-
vation de notre vie, qu'il
exclut toute vue de
plaisir.—Il met au rang
des

"The unfeeling can-
didate for heaven was
instructed not only to
resist the grosser allure-
ments of the taste or
smell, but even to shut
*his ears against the pro-
fane harmony of sounds,*
and to view with indif-
ference the most finished
productions of human
art. Gay apparel, mag-
nificent houses, and ele-
gant furniture, were sup-
posed to unite the double
guilt of pride and sen-
suality: a simple and
mortified appearance was
more suitable to the
Christian who was cer-
tain of his sins and
doubtful

* Chap. v. sect. 15. p. 49.

BARBEYRAC.

des excès de bouche condamnables, l'usage du *pain blanc* : c'est, dit-il, "*effeminer & tourner un aliment nécessaire en op-probre de volupté* *."

" Il blâme sans distinction tous ceux qui font venir des vins agréables de quelque Pays étranger," &c.—" Il passe de là † aux vases, & autres meubles, dont il fait une longue énumération. Il condamne absolument tout ce qui est d'or, d'argent, ou de quelque autre matière, dont l'emploi n'est pas nécessaire pour les besoins de la vie ‡." &c.

" *Clement* règle le tems du Sommeil, & la manière dont on doit se coucher §. Il ne veut rien ici de précieux, ni de moû. Il tourne en exemple à imiter par obligation, ce que *JACOB* fit par nécessité : & il dit, que ce Patriarche fut jugé digne d'une vision céleste, pendant qu'il avoit une Pierre pour oreiller ||."

GIBBON.

doubtful of his salvation. In their censures of luxury, the Fathers are extremely minute and circumstantial; and among the various articles which excite their pious indignation, we may enumerate *false hair, garments of any colour except white, instruments of music, vases of gold or silver, downy pillows (as Jacob reposed his head on a stone) white bread, foreign wines, public salutations, the use of warm baths, and the practice of shaving the beard*, which, according to the expression of *Tertullian*, is a lie against our own faces, and an impious attempt to improve the works of the Creator. *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23. *Clement Alexandrin. Pædagog.* l. iii. c. 8."

* C. v. sect. 13.

† Chap. iii.

‡ Sect. xiv. p. 48.

§ Chap. ix.

|| Sect. xvii. p. 50.

BARBEYRAC.

“ Il condamne ici absolument toute *teinture d'Etoffes*.—Il n'y a que le *Blanc*, qui convienne à la *candeur* du Chretien :—Il defend de porter aucun *or*, aucunes *Perles*, aucunes *Pierreries* *.”

“ Il continue, à *censurer en détail les excès* ou les *Femmes* tombent sur cette article †.”

“ De là il vient aux *Hommes* ‡, & non content de blamer en eux tout ce qui a quelque chose d'*effeminé*, il va jusqu'à *taxer de crime ceux qui se font raser la barbe*. Il y trouve même de l'*impiété*, &c. §—Il revient aux *bains*, dont il condamne tout usage ||, point de *Bains chauds*; parce, dit il, qu'il y a d'autres moiens de se rechauffer.

“ Il traite de *grande impiété l'usage des faux-cheveux*, &c. **

“ Il ne veut pas, que les Chrétiens *se saluent en vuë*, comme si c'étoit une *liberté* insentée,” &c.

It is now plain beyond a doubt, that Mr. G.'s description of the severe morality of the Fathers, is servilely copied, from what Barbeyrac had extracted from Clemens; though he has *cited*, and

* Sect. 18.

† Livre iii. c. ii.

‡ Dans le chap. iii.

§ Sect. 20. I before promised to inform my reader whence Mr. G. had borrowed this observation, respecting *the impiety of shaving the beard*, and I doubt not but he will be satisfied that it was from *Barbeyrac*; who, as he quotes in this page *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23, and is treating of *Clemens Alexandrin*, l. iii. c. 3. in this particular section, might readily furnish our author with his references to *Tertullian de Spectaculis*, c. 23. and *Clemens Alexandrin*. l. iii. c. 8.

|| Chap. ix.

** It is observed, p. 120, 121. that this custom is condemned by Cyprian, and by *Tertullian de cultu Femin.* c. 6, 7. p. 156, 157.

would persuade us, that he has consulted, "a work
" of Clemens of Alexandria entitled the *Pedagogue* *;"
and has made a different arrangement from that
in Barbeyrac, in hopes of disguising the plagiarism.

VII.

BARBEYRAC.

"Tertullien condamne
absolument *tout métier,*
toute profession, tout com-
merce qui regarde des
choses dont les payens
peuvent faire quelque usage
pour des actes d'idolatrie;
quand même on n'au-
roit pas d'autre moyen de
subsister †." *Traité de*
l'Idolatrie, c. 11, 12.

GIBBON.

"It was the first but
arduous duty of a Chris-
tian to preserve himself
pure and undefiled by
the practice of idolatry.
Every art and every trade
that was in the least con-
cerned in the framing or
adorning of idols, was pol-
luted by the stain of idola-
try †." Tertullian de Ido-
latria, c. 10. & 11.

VIII.

"Faut-il s'étonner,
après cela, si Tertullien
regarde la vie militaire
comme absolument in-
compatible avec les
règles de l'Évangile." §

"Il est vrai qu'il
semble (de *coron. milit.*
c. 11.) ailleurs *permettre*
la profession des armes
à ceux

"The Christians were
not less averse to the
business than to the plea-
sures of this world ||, &c.

"Some *indulgence*
might perhaps be allow-
ed to those persons who,
before their conversion,
were already engaged in
such violent and sanguin-
ary

* Note 87, c. xv.

† C. vi. sect. 5.

‡ P. 464. and notes 39. 45. c. xv.

§ Sect. 6.

|| P. 485, 486.

BARBEYRAC.

à ceux qui y étoient déjà engagés avant leur bapême*.”

“ L’Apologie du Christianisme n’en demandoit pas davantage, quelle que fût l’opinion de Tertullien. Bien loin de là : s’il eut insinué, que l’Evangile défendoit de porter les armes, il auroit lui-même donné lieu aux Païens d’accuser les Chrétiens d’être de mauvais sujets, qui refusoient d’aller à la guerre, même pour la défense de l’Etat†.”

“ Il faut dire la même chose du crime que Tertullien trouve dans plusieurs autres choses, hors de la guerre, comme à orner la porte de sa maison de lampes & de lauriers, dans une réjouissance publique ordonnée

GIBBON.

ary occupations.” Tertullian, de Corona militis, c. 11 †, &c.

“ This indolent, or even criminal, disregard to the public welfare, exposed them to the contempt and reproaches of the pagans, who very frequently asked what must be the fate of the empire, attacked on every side by the barbarians, if all mankind should adopt the pusillanimous sentiments of the new sect §.”

“ Some idea may be conceived of the abhorrence of the Christians for such impious ceremonies, by the scrupulous delicacy which they displayed on a much less alarming occasion. On days of general festivity, it was the custom of the ancients to adorn their doors

* Sect. 8.

† Sect. 7.

‡ Mr. G. constantly finds some expedient to disguise his plagiarism; thus he does not make this reference immediately after writing the sentence borrowed from Barbeyrac, but in the following one (at note 100.) and makes some addition to the note, to have the honour of calling it his own.

§ P. 486. *Origin*, l. viii. p. 423. is referred to, note 101. c. xv. I shall account for this shortly.

BARBEYRAC.

donnée par le Prince. La raison, qu'il en donne, est, que les Payens reconnoissoient & adoroient de fausses divinitez, ou des démons, comme presidant aux portes & aux portaux des maisons." De Idolat. c. xv. *

" Il est faux d'ailleurs, que,—après Tertullien, toutes sortes de couronnes, & principalement celles de laurier, contre lesquelles il déclame, eussent du rapport à l'idolatrie. Quoi que le LAURIER fut regardé par les Paiens, comme un arbre consacré à APOLLON, ou à BACCHUS, il n'en suit nullement de là, que, toutes les fois, qu'on mettoit sur sa tête, une couronne de laurier, on la prit en vuë de cette consecration religieuse †."

GIBBON.

doors with lamps and with branches of laurel, and to crown their heads with a garland of flowers. This innocent and elegant practice might perhaps have been tolerated as a mere civil institution. But it most unluckily happened, that the doors were under the protection of the household gods, that the laurel was sacred to the lover of Daphne and that garlands of flowers, though frequently worn either as a symbol of joy or mourning, had been dedicated in their first origin to the service of superstition ‡." Tertul. de Idol.

" Tertullian has composed a rash defence, or rather panegyric, of the rash action of a Christian soldier, who, by throwing away his crown of laurel, had exposed himself and his brethren to the most imminent danger §."

* Sect. 11.

† Sect. 17. c. vi. This is particularly applied to the soldiers on account of their attendance at these idolatrous ceremonies at sect. 9.

‡ Page 465, 466.

§ Note 49. c. xv.

This

Our author, in confirmation of some of these remarks, has cited *Origen contra Celsum* as follow-
 l. v. p. 253. l. vii. p. 348. l. viii. p. 423—428*.
 I appeal to the reader if we can otherwise account for his having pointed out not only the same passages, but even the very same pages, which, we shall see Barbeyrac has done; than by supposing that he has transcribed his references. We shall see also that he is furnished hence with his references to Tertullian.

BARBEYRAC.

“ C’est ainsi qu’il a
 toujours regardé la pro-
 fession militaire, comme
 interdite aux Chrétiens.
 Il (*Origen*) se déclare là-
 dessus, de la manière la
 plus forte, à la fin de
 son traité contre *CELSE*,
 où il dit, que “ les Chré-
 “ tiens se contentent de
 “ prier DIEU pour l’Em-
 “ pereur, mais qu’ils ne
 “ portent point les armes
 “ pour lui, quand même
 “ il voudroit les y con-
 “ traindre, lib. viii. p.
 “ 427.” † Il condamne,

un

GIBBON.

“ It was acknow-
 ledged that, under a less
 perfect law, the powers
 of the Jewish constitu-
 tion had been exercised,
 with the approbation of
 heaven, by inspired pro-
 phets, and by anointed
 kings. *The Christians*
felt and confessed, that
such institutions might be
necessary for the present
system of the world, and
they cheerfully submit-
ted to the authority of
their pagan governors.
 But while they incul-
 cated

* Note 99. c. xv.

† Ημῶς καὶ μάλλον, &c.

Lactantius is cited as corroborating this opinion; *Instit. Divin.* l. vi. c. 20. & seqq. by Barbeyrac c. ix. § 3. and is appealed to by Mr. G. (at Note 86.) *Institut. Divin.* l. vi. c. 20, 21, 22.

BARBEYRAC.

GIBBON.

un peu plus bas, l'exercice de tout magistrature: & ailleurs il rend raison, à sa manière, de la différence qu'il y a, selon lui, à cet égard, entre les Juifs, & les Chrétiens. Lib. v. p. 253. lib. vii. p. 348. 349.

"C'est le même système, que Tertullien, & autres Pères, se sont fait ici. Ils croioient que les Magistratures, & les guerres, étoient nécessaires, pour l'entretien de la Société Civile, & la défense des peuples. Ainsi ils en tenoient l'usage légitime par rapport aux anciens Juifs, & aux Païens, mais non pas pour cela par rapport aux Chrétiens, à qui ils s'imaginoient que l'Evangile le défendoit †."

"Tertullien—condamne absolument la recherche &

cated the maxims of passive obedience, they refused to take any active part in the civil administration, or the military defence of the empire,—it was impossible that Christians, without renouncing a more sacred duty, could assume the character of soldiers, of magistrates, or of princes *." Tertullian. Apolog. c. 21. de Idololatria c. 17, 18.

"Their simplicity was offended by the use of oaths, by the pomp of magistracy, and by the active contention of public life, nor could their humane ignorance be convinced, that it was lawful on any occasion to shed the blood of our fellow creatures either by the sword of justice or by that of war; even though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace and safety of the whole community †"

* Page 486. Tertullian is referred to by Mr. G. in the preceding part of this sentence, note 99. c. xv.

† Page 486. Mr. G. here very concisely says, in a note (98, c. xv.) See the Morale des Pères," &c.

‡ Chap. 7. p. 104. Note 1.

BARBEYRAC.

*l'exercice des emplois publics, surtout de ceux qui imposent la nécessité de condamner à mort les criminels. " On demande, (dit Tertullien) " Si un " serviteur de Dieu peut se charger de quelque " dignité, ou de quelque magistrature," &c. * de idol. c. 17. 18.*

Barbeyrac then enumerates *the almost insurmountable difficulties*, as Mr. G. calls them, and proceeds with this remark :

Tertullien met en ce rang non seulement l'obligation de faire serment †, dont il semble condamner entièrement l'usage : mais encore la nécessité de juger dans les cas où il s'agit de la vie ou de l'honneur, de prononcer quelque sentence de condamnation ou de faire des loix qui l'autorisent, d'ordonner qu'on met quelqu'un aux fers, ou en prison, ou à la torture : toutes choses, qu'il suppose par la manifestement être incompatibles avec la qualité de Chrétien ‡."

" Ce Pere, dit, que le seul appareil des marques de dignité qui sont attachées aux charges publiques, les doit faire fuir à un Chrétien, comme des choses originellement consacrées à l'idolatrie : outre qu'on les emploie aussi en l'honneur des idoles §." de Idol. c. 18.

" Il n'y a sujet de s'étonner, que Tertullien ait regardé comme incompatibles, la qualité d'Empereur, & celle de Chrétien ||.

* Sect. 21. † See also c. ii. sect. 5. 15. where *Justin* is represented as teaching the same doctrine; and c. iii. sect. 6. the same is said of *Irenæus*.

‡ Sect. 22.

§ Sect. 24.

|| Sect. 26.

IX.

BARBEYRAC.

See what this author says further on the above subject, and his remarks on the apology of Tertullian, respecting the information of Pontius Pilate given to Tiberius, of the unjust death of Jesus, and the conduct of that emperor on the occasion*. I shall extract some of the more striking passages.

“ Tibère, selon que l'assure Tertullien, reconnu dans son cœur la divinité de Jésus-Christ, il alla même jusqu'à proposer sa croiance au sénat,”
 &c.

Et n'ayant pu lui persuader de mettre Jésus-Christ au nombre des divinités reconnues par autorité publique, il se réduisit à défendre, sous menaces de son indignation, de dénoncer les Chrétiens pour être punis comme tels.”

“ Il y a, dit M. Dupin, plusieurs savans, qui

GIBBON.

Compare this with the words of Mr. G. respecting the *suspicious instance contained in Tertullian's apology*; that *“ Pontius Pilate informed the emperor of the unjust sentence of death, which he had pronounced against an innocent, and, as it appeared, a divine person; and that Tiberius immediately conceived the design of placing the Jewish Messiah among the gods of Rome; that his servile senate ventured to disobey the commands of their master; that Tiberius, instead of resenting their refusal, contented himself with protecting the Christians from the severity of the laws &c.”* &c.

“ The first of these examples,” (that is, the edict

* C. vi. sect. 27—30.

BARBEYRAC.

qui doutent de la vérité de cette histoire, qui dans le fond à très-peu de vraisemblance. Car quelle apparence, que PILATE écrivît à Tibère ces choses d'un homme qu'il avoit

condamné à mort ? Et, quand il les lui auroit écrites, est-il vraisemblable que TIBERE eût proposé au sénat, de mettre cette homme au nombre des dieux, sur la simple relation d'un gouverneur ? Et s'il l'eût proposé, qui peut douter que le sénat ne se put aussi tôt rendu à son sentiment * ?”

GIBBON.

edict of Tiberius) “ is attended with some difficulties which might perplex a sceptical mind †.”

X.

“ Tertullien dit, que c'est le diable qui chauffe les brodequins aux acteurs.—La vanité seule étoit leur principe ; le désir de paroître d'une stature grande & majestueuse lors qu'ils représentoient le personnage de quelques Héros, leur faisoit emprunter de l'art, ce que la nature leur avoit refusé ‡.”

“ The Christian, with pious horror avoided the abomination of the circus, or the theatre §.”

Mr. G. here adds this note :

“ See Tertullian. de Spectaculis. This severe reformer shews no more indulgence to a tragedy of Euripides, than to a combat of gladiators. The dress of

“ Sic

the

* Sect. 29.

† Page 556. My reader should be told that Mr. G. does not refer to Barbeyrac at this place. I would point out likewise his singular expression, “ We are required to believe,” &c. as if this were an article of the Christian faith ; and, no doubt, he meant it was sufficiently superstitious to deserve a place in our Creed.

‡ Sect. 20. p. 81.

§ Page 464.

BARBEYRAC.

" Sic et tragœdos co-
 " thurnis extulit (diabo-
 " lus) quia nemo potest ad-
 " jicere cubitum unum ad
 " staturam suam. Men-
 " dacem facere vult
 " Christum." De Spec-
 " taculis, cap. 23 *.

GIBBON.

the actors particularly
 offends him; by the use
 of the lofty buskin, they
 impiously strive to add a
 cubit to their stature,"
 c. 23 †.

XI.

" On peut dire la
 même chose de la con-
 damnation de la fuite
 en tems de persécution.
Tertullien a dé-
 veloppé, et poussé de
 toute sa force dans de
 livre qu'il fit tout exprès
 là dessus, étant Monta-
 niste, cette opinion ri-
 gide et fausse, dont on
 voit l'ébauche dans les
 ouvrages écrits avant sa
 séparation §," &c.

" Tertullian considers
 flight from persecution,
 as an imperfect, but
 very criminal, apostacy,
 as an impious attempt to
 elude the will of God,
 &c. &c. He has writ-
 ten a treatise on this
 subject, which is filled
 with the wildest fanati-
 cism, and the most in-
 coherent declamation ||."

XII.

" A l'égard des ma-
 nières de parler usitées,
 qui ont quelque rapport à
 l'idolatrie, il n'est pas
 vrai, que, *Tertullien*
 n'en trouve l'usage mau-
 vais,

" Even the common
 language of Greece and
 Rome abounded with
 familiar but impious ex-
 pressions, which the im-
 prudent Christian might
 too

* Note 2.

§ Sect. 31. p. 89.

† Note 41. c. xv.

|| Note 99. c. xvi.

BARBEYRAC.

vais, qu'autant que nous contribuons par là au culte des idoles. Il permet seulement quelques-uns de ces expressions : mais en même tems il en condamne d'autres, qui ne sont pas plus mauvaises." — pourquoi, en parlant d'*Esculape*, d'*Isis*, de *Jupiter*, &c. ne pourra-t-on pas les appeller *Dieux*, sans ajouter aussitôt quelque chose par où l'on déclare expressément qu'on les tient pour faux ? C'est néanmoins ce que *Tertullien* défend." De Idololatr. c. 20, &c. *

GIBBON.

too carelessly utter, or too patiently hear †." Tertullian de Idololatria, c. 20, 21, 22.

" If a pagan friend used the familiar expression of "*Jupiter bless you*," the Christian was obliged to protest against the divinity of Jupiter ‡."

XIII.

" *Tertullien* rapporte un mot, d'un Proconsul d'*Asie*, qui, las de condamner à mort les *Chrétiens* d'une ville de sa province, qui venoient en foule se déclarer à lui ce qu'ils étoient ; après en avoir envoie quelques-uns au supplice, dit aux autres : "*Hé malheureux ! si vous voulez tant mourir, n'avez-*
vous

" *Unhappy men*," exclaimed the proconsul Antoninus to the Christians of Asia, "*unhappy men, if you are thus weary of your lives, is it so difficult for you to find ropes and pices* §." Tertullian ad Scapul. c. 5. ||.

Compare also what Mr. G. says, of " their impatient zeal, that they rushed

* Sect. 15. p. 78.

† Note 47. c. xv.

|| Note 95. c. xvi.

† Page 565.

§ Page 552.

BARBEYRAC.

"vous pas des précipices,
 "ou des cordes?" ad Sca-
 pul. cap. ult. *

GIBBON.

*rushed in crouds round the
 tribunal of the magistrates;
 and that the proconsul,
 having condemned a few,
 dismissed the rest."*

XIV.

Mr. G. has extended the remarks which Barbeyrac, in the words of Le Clerc †, makes on the conduct of Cyprian, to other bishops. Some of the sentences, which bear a great similarity, I have extracted.

"Cyprien soutient, qu'il n'y a dans l'Eglise qu'un seul Pontiffe, & qu'un seul Juge, *etabli pour un tems en la place de Jesus Christ*. Après le jugement de Dieu, ajoute-t-il, après le suffrage du peuple, après le consentement des autres évêques, personne ne se rendroit juge, je ne dirai pas d'un évêque, mais de Dieu. —Notre martyr, irrité par les schismatiques, ne se possède presque pas, des qu'il tombe sur cette matière, & oublie

"The prelates of the third century—exalted the unity and power of the church, as it was represented in the *Episcopal Office*:—It was the episcopal authority alone which was derived from the Deity, and extended itself over this, and over another world. *The bishops were the vicegerents of Christ, &c.* ‡;—covering their ambition with the fair pretence of the love of order, they were jealous of any rival in the exercise of discipline, &c.

"From

* Sect. 8. p. 18.

† Le Clerc. Bibl. Univer. tom. xii. p. 308, &c. suiv.

This reference gave our author a fair opportunity of citing Le Clerc.

‡ P. 491, 492.

BARBEYRAC.

blie souvent les règles du bon raisonnement, de même que celles de la bienséance, comme lorsqu'il dit dans la même lettre, " Qu'il n'est pas de la dignité ni de la majesté de l'Eglise Catholique, de s'informer de ce que l'audace des hérétiques & des schismatiques entreprend." *Un sénateur Romain n'auroit pas parlé avec plus de gravité de la Majesté de l'empire ; mais il faut avouer que l'humilité & la douceur du Christianisme n'éclatent pas beaucoup dans ces paroles.*

—St. Cyprien applique à ceux qui se rébellent contre les évêques, divers passages de l'Écriture sainte touchant les orgueilleux, & ceux qui s'élevoient contre les Sacrificateurs de l'ancienne loi." *

See also c. vii. sect. 4. 8.

GIBBON.

" From the imperious declamations of Cyprian, we should naturally conclude, that it was much less dangerous for the disciples of Christ to neglect the observance of the moral duties, than to despise the censures and authority of their bishops. Sometimes we might imagine, that we were listening to the voice of Moses, when he commanded the earth to open and to swallow up, in consuming flames, the rebellious race which refused obedience to the priesthood of Aaron ; and we should sometimes suppose that we heard a Roman consul asserting the majesty of the republic, and declaring his inflexible resolution to enforce the rigour of the laws †."

See also p. 501, 502.

* C. viii. sect. 47.

† Page 501.

XV.

BARBEYRAC.

See what this author says on *celibacy*, and the disorders that accrue from its being held in esteem, p. 116.

Also his remarks on those women who, professing continency, cohabited with men, yet maintained their chastity to be still unpolluted; and that this custom was forbid by several councils *.

GIBBON.

Compare with this the account of Mr. G. that "the virgins of Africa permitted priests and deacons to share their bed, and gloried amidst the flames in their unsullied purity; and of the scandal introduced by this custom into the church †."

XVI.

"Quelle prise, surtout, l'orgueil n'a-t-il pas, dans le coeur de gens qui se flattent d'une perfection extraordinaire, par laquelle ils se croient fort élevez au dessus du commun des Chrétiens ? L'esprit de domination sur les consciences, ou le trouve-t-on, si ce n'est chez ces prêtres & ces reclus, qui ont renoncé au mariage ?" ‡

"It was consistent with the same principles to consider a state of celibacy as the nearest approach to the divine perfection.

"The loss of sensual pleasure was supplied and compensated by spiritual pride §."

* C. viii. Sect. 26.

‡ P. 118, 119.

† Page 485.

§ Page 485.

XVII.

XVII.

BARBEYRAC.

Read what this writer says on the toleration of paganism, and the reason he assigns for the Romans having persecuted the Christians; also his reflection on the mutual persecutions of the Christians. See c. xii. p. 191. &c.

GIBBON.

Compare what Mr. G. tells us of the universal toleration of polytheism, and the reasons he assigns for the persecution of the Christians by the Romans; and "the melancholy truth," he mentions, "that the Christians have inflicted far greater severities on each other, than they had experienced from the zeal of infidels." See p. 519, 520. 523. 585.

XVIII.

See what is said on *vigils*, and their *abuse*, c. xv. § 20, 21. "Cet abus s'augmenta si fort, que le concile d'ELVIRE fut obligé de défendre aux femmes d'aller la nuit dans les cimetières," &c. Canon. 35. See also § 22.

Part of note 22, in the xvth chapter, is, "The 35th canon of the council of Illiberis provides against the scandals which too often polluted the *vigils* of the church."

XX.

"Les premiers Chrétiens à la vérité s'assembloient de nuit; mais c'étoit par nécessité, à cause des persécutions, qui ne leur permettoient pas de le faire de jour.

Mais,

"The precautions with which the disciples of Christ performed the offices of religion, were at first dictated by fear and necessity; but they were continued from choice.

By

P

BARBEYRAC.

Mais, sous les em-
peurs Chrétiens, *cette*
coûtume, comme plusieurs
autres, s'introduisit, par
une imitation du paga-
nisme, d'où sortoient un
grand nombre de Chre-
tiens." c. xv. p. 258.

GIBBON.

By *imitating* the awful
secrecy which reigned in
the Eleusinian mysteries,
the Christians had flat-
tered themselves, that
they should render their
sacred institutions more
respectable in the eyes
of the pagan world."
p. 527.

XX.

Barbeyrac speaks of
the very insipid and
strange allegories of the
Fathers, c. vii. p. 95.—
104. and the pious frauds
made use of by them,
p. 82.

Mr. G.'s expressions
are, "*their affected con-*
ceits and cold allegories,
p. 517. *pious deception,*
and *pious forgeries,* note
59. c. xv.

XXI.

Lastly, I shall point out their similar remarks on
the conduct of the holy martyr *Ignatius*.

"Louons le zèle en
lui-même, & contentons
nous d'excuser ce qui a
eu besoin d'indulgence.
Il n'y a pas moien de re-
garder autrement ces in-
stances véhémentes que
faisoit *Ignace au Romains,*
de ne pas travailler,
quand il les en prioit
lui-même, à le garantir
du supplice, *comme si*
par là ils lui envioient la
couronne

"The epistles which
Ignatius composed as he
was carried in chains
through the cities in
Asia, breathe sentiments
the most repugnant to
the ordinary feelings of
human nature. He
earnestly beseeches the Ro-
mans, that when he
should be exposed in
the amphitheatre, they
would not, by their kind,
but

BARBEYRAC.

GIBBON.

couronne du martyr; ces but unreasonable inter-
exhortations à flatter les cession, deprive him of
bêtes féroces, afin qu'elles the crown of glory; and
le dévorassent entière- he declares his resolution
ment; ce dessein où il té- to provoke and irritate
moigne être de les irriter the wild beasts which
lui-même, de peur qu'el- might be employed as
les ne le respectassent, the instruments of his
comme il étoit arrivé à death †." Epist. ad
*quelques confesseurs ** Roman. c. 4. 5. ap. Pa-
 &c. Ignat. Epist. ad tres Apostol. tom. ii.
 Romanos, c. 4. 5. p. 27, p. 27.
 &c.

I have now traced, at a great length, the passages in Barbeyrac from which our author appears to have collected many of his observations; the greater part of them, as we have seen, relate to the morality of the Fathers. But surely his second-hand reflexions can no more impair or vilify their conduct, than his former stale objections to miracles can prejudice the truth of Christianity: It argues indeed no small degree of presumption in Mr. Gibbon, to think that his engaging language will atone for obtruding on the world, as his own, these antiquated censures of the Fathers; the severity of many of which can be exceeded only by their *injustice*.

Instances of Plagiarism from DAILLE'.

The mode in which Barbeyrac has treated the writings of the Fathers, is very different from that

* C. viii. sect. 37.

† P. 552. note 92. c. xvi.

in which Daillé has pointed out *their use* †; who as a generous opponent, and as a good Christian, with regret exposed the failings and errors of such truly venerable men, while he takes every opportunity of pointing out the excellencies of their works, and the claim they have to our esteem and credit *. Our author, therefore, could not expect to find so much that suited his purpose, in the treatise of Daillé: Yet I shall now shew, though he has quoted it but once, and that only in his third edition †, that he is obliged to it for several remarks, which he has not been candid enough to acknowledge. Middleton and Barbeyrac have been equally forgetful of their obligations to the same author.

I.

DAILLÉ.

GIBBON.

“ *Ego* (inquit Justinus) “ The testimony of
 “ *Et qui per omnia rectè Justin, of his own faith*
 “ *sentiant Christiani, Et and that of his orthodox*
 “ *carnis resurrectionem brethren in the doctrine of*
 “ *futuram novimus, Et a Millennium, is deliver-*
 “ *mille annos in urbe ed in the clearest and*
 Hieru- most

† I have made use of the Latin translation of Daillé's *Use of the Fathers*.

* “ *Ægre quidem, et, quod ait poeta αἰνέσσειν, hanc disputationis partem aggredior. Grave enim est, & à pudore nostro alienum, hominum, præsertim sanctorum & merito venerabilium, rævos ac labe spectare ac ostentare,*” p. 253.

“ *Itaque etiam si patribus defuisset summa illa ingenii atque eruditionis excellentia qua atheos faciliè superarunt, illorum tamen vel nudæ voces horum testimonio essent anteponendæ. Apparet enim & horum contra Christianam veritatem judicium odii merito suspectum esse; & illorum de Christi & evangelii divinitate voces ab omni studio puras & immunes esse.*”

See also his encomiums on the Fathers, p. 356. 363. &c.

† See note 64. c. xvi. 3d edition.

DAILLÉ.

“*Hierusalem instaura-
ta agendos.*”

“His verbis omnes suo tempore catholicos in eo errore versatos, soloque hæreticos ab eo alienos fuisse testatur. Scio ipsum supra dixisse, multos esse qui sunt in pia & pura Christianorum sententia qui hoc non agnoscunt. Verum hæc adeo discrepantia conciliet qui potest. Omnes qui recta sentiunt, sunt in ea opinione, & multi qui recta sentiunt sunt ab ea opinione alieni. Inquirat etiam, cui vacabit, an nullum sit in Justinianicis codicibus mendum*.” Justin. contr. Tryphon. p. 306.

“Quod si ad secula inferiora descendas—Hieronymus scribit hoc delirium a multis receptum fuisse, & ad superiores, quos jam nominavimus, Lactantium addit,” &c. p. 288. See also p. 255, &c.

GIBBON.

most solemn manner (Dialog. cum Tryphonte Jud. p. 177, 178. edit. Benedictin.) *If in the beginning of this important passage there is any thing like an inconsistency, we may impute it, as we think proper, either to the author, or to his transcribers†.*”

“The assurance of such a Millennium was carefully inculcated by a succession of the Fathers, from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, down to Lactantius,” p. 471.

II.

“Cyprianus quidem docet ecclesiam sui temporis magnam variis in locis

“The deliberations of the provincial councils were assisted by the advice

* Page 287.

† Note 65. c. xv. 3d edit. Dailly is not appealed to in this note.

DAILLÉ,

GIBBON.

locis ejus rationem habuisse, adeo ut *nihil quod esset alicujus momenti absque fidelium sententia gereretur*, ut in ejus epistolis videre est. Certè quæstio de baptismo hæreticorum, de qua supra nonnihil jam diximus, in synodo, Carthagine, *præsentē etiam plebis maximā parte agitata fuit.*" p. 195.

advice of a few distinguished presbyters, and moderated by the presence of a listening multitude †. Aëta Concil. Carthag apud Cyprian, *præsentē plebis maximā parte*."

III.

"Hujus (Tertulliani) unicus admirator Cyprianus, ut etiam eum, propter excellentiam, magistrum vocitare soleret †," &c.

Daillé here gives us the following note :

"Hieron. l. de Script. Eccl. in Tertull. t. i. p. 365. Vidi ego quendam Paulum—quise B. Cypriani notarium,—Romæ vidisse diceret, referrique sibi solitum, nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diē præterisse; ac sibi crebro dicere, Da

Mr. G. in his third edition, has inserted the following words as part of a note : "in order to ascertain the degree of authority which the zealous African had acquired, it may be sufficient to allege the testimony of Cyprian, the doctor and guide of all the western churches. As often as he applied himself to his daily study of the writings of Tertullian, he was accustomed to say, "Da mibi magistrum;" Give me my master."

† Page 491.

* Note 113, c. xv.

† Page 262.

Da magistrum, Tertullia- master." *Hieronym. de*
num, videlicet, signifi- *Viris Illustribus, c. 53†.*
cans."

IV.

DAILLE'.

GIBBON.

"Si quis vero objiciat
 seculum ipsum, quod
 proximè ætatem aposto-
 lorum consecutum est,
 non debere ab ista suspi-
 cione immune esse, cum
Hegesippus, apud Eusebi-
um, testetur ecclesiam vir-
ginem intactam & incor-
ruptam usque ad Trajani
*tempora permanuisse *,"*
 &c. Euseb. Hist. Ec-
 cles. lib. iii. c. 26.

"It has been remark-
 ed, with more ingenui-
 ty than truth, that *the*
virgin purity of the church
was never violated by
schism or heresy before
the reign of Trajan, about
one hundred years after
the death of Christ §."
Hegesippus ap. Euseb. l.
 iii. 32. iv. 22. ||

"Non enim comminiscendi fingendique artes
 novæ sunt; harum fraudum artifices ante quatuor-
 decim secula extiterunt †." Hagesip. ap. Euseb.
 l. iv. c. 22.

V.

"Extant etiam Acta
 Synodi Carthaginien-
 sis in qua 87 episcopi, unani-
 mi suffragio, id ipsum
 con-

Mr. G. gives us this
 note (113. c. xv.) "Ac-
 ta Concil. Carthag. apud
 Cyprian," &c. This
 coun-

† Note 70. 3d edit. Our author, in this and some other in-
 stances, seems to have adopted a new expedient. Having found a
 remark, that he wishes to insert, with a reference to some learn-
 ed writer, he then consults a different edition, and varies the
 page, in order to disguise his plagiarism.

• Page 2.

† Page 22.

§ Page 461.

|| Note 30. c. xv,

DAILLÉ.
constituerunt." p. 187.

GIBBON.
council was composed of
eighty-seven bishops.

VI.

Observe what he says of Justin's words, that "Socrates and other pagans who lived according to reason are to be esteemed as Christians." See p. 256.

It is also Mr. G.'s remark, that "a charitable hope might perhaps be indulged in favour of Socrates, &c. who had consulted the light of reason," &c. p. 473. and note 69.

VII.

See his remarks on the wild notion of Gregory, that Ætna, and the other burning mountains in Sicily, and in that neighbourhood, are the beginnings of the conflagration, and the places of infernal torment, p. 242.

See also what our historian observes, that "the country which had been chosen for the origin and principle scene of the conflagration, was best adapted for that purpose by natural and physical causes, p. 473.

It is now plain, that several of our author's remarks, were selected from this excellent treatise. But I cannot help observing, with the learned Cave, "what regret it would have caused to the pious Daillé, had he been now alive, to see even one single argument which he had urged to overthrow the superstition of popery, and thereby purify and strengthen the Christian religion,"

I

thus

thus perverted, to undermine and sap its foundation*.

I shall close this article with a quotation from Mr. de la Croze, in which justice is done to Mr. Daillé; and a character is drawn of certain vilifiers of the Fathers, among whom I wish the candid reader may not rank our Historian.

“ Parmi ceux, qui méprisent les Pères, il peut y avoir d'habiles gens, qui le sont, ou par préjugé, ou parce qu'ils craignent qu'on ne donne trop à leur autorité.—On ne cherche ordinairement dans leurs ouvrages que l'histoire des dogmes, & celle de l'Eglise. Pendant qu'on n'ira point sur ce sujet plus loin que Mr. Daillé, dans son traité de *l'emploi des Peres*, on se tiendra, ce me semble, dans des bornes assez raisonnables. Mais il y a des gens qui ne sont forts, ni en raisonnement, ni en critique, qui n'ont jamais lu une page des pères, & qui ne les connoissent que par le *Medulla Sculteti*, par l'Histoire-Littéraire de Mr. Cave, & par la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de Mr. du Pin. Il est dangereux de se trouver devant ces gens-là, quand ils commencent leurs invectives contre les pères : ils croiroient leur faire grace s'ils leur laissoient une once de savoir & de probité.” &c. *Entretiens sur divers sujets d'histoire*, p. 212.

* “ At si in vivis jam esset, quam ægrè ferret vir pientissimus, si aliqui reperientur, qui argumentis, quibus ipse causam pontificiam adeo feliciter debellavit, ad labefaciendam & subvertendam Nicænam fidem, abuterentur.” *Epist. Apolg.* p. 18.

Instances of PLAGIARISM from BEAUSOBRE.

The extensive reading and uncommon erudition of *Beausobre* have enabled Mr. G. to display great parade of learning. And as this author openly avows a design to *apologize* for the *heretics*, which consequently induces him frequently to *handle the Fathers rather severely*; nothing could more aptly coincide with the wishes of Mr. Gibbon.

At one note, where he has quoted *Beausobre*, he seems inadvertently to furnish proofs of the charge I bring against him, that *he has transcribed Beausobre's reference to another learned publication*. The instance is as follows:

BEAUSOBRE.

" *P'espere, que bien loin d'ennuyer le lecteur, je le délasserai, si avant que continuer l'histoire de Manichée, je lui raconte l'origine de la religion Chrétienne en Perse,*" &c. See also p. 183. 193.

" On peut voir, sur *l'origine de Christianisme dans la Perse*, la I. Dissertation de M. *Asséman* touchant les Nestoriens, laquelle est à la tête de la

II,

GIBBON.

" According to *Bar-desanes* (ap. *Euseb. Præpar. Evangel.*) there were *some Christians in Persia before the end of the second century*. In the time of *Constantine* (see his *Epistle to Sapor*, *Vit.* l. iv. c. 13.) they composed a flourishing church. Consult *Beausobre Hist. Critique du Manichéisme*, tom. i. p. 180. and the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*

BEAUSOBRE.

GIBBON.

II. Partie de son III. *Orientalis of Assemani*†." tome. Voyez aussi la I. Partie, p. 611 *."

I.

" Il n'est pas aisé de qualifier au juste le zèle de ces anciens évêques, qui les premiers portèrent les empereurs Chrétiens à condamner au feu les livres des hérétiques, & à décerner des peines de mort contre ceux qui les lisoient, ou qui les garderoient dans leurs maisons." p. 218.

" The philosophers composed against the faith of the Gospel many elaborate treatises, which have since been committed to the flames by the prudence of orthodox emperors." p. 566.

He then gives us this

note. " Voyez *Socrat.* de H. E. c. i. 19. La Loi que *Constantin* donna contre ceux qui écrivoient, ou qui garderoient, les livres d'*Arius*, est d'une sévérité inexcusable." He refers to *Codex Theodosian.* at c. xiii.

See *Socrates Hist. Eccl.* l. i. 19 ‡. *Codex Theodosian.* &c.

II.

" Ces livres, (des Sibylles) tout favorables qu'ils étoient à la religion Chrétienne, méritoient d'être supprimés, parce

" Whilst the happiness and glory of a temporal reign were promised to the disciples of Christ, the most dreadful calamities

* Liv. ii. c. iii. § i. p. 180. Though the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* is not here specified as the work of *Assemani* which is alluded to, yet the frequent mention made of it by *Beausobre*, must assure Mr. G. that it was no other.

† Note 180. c. xv.

‡ Note 142. c. xvi.

BEAUSOBRE.

parce qu' au fond ils a-
voient été supposez par
des imposteurs, & que
celui, qui portoit le
nom d'*Hystaspes* predisoit
la ruïne de l'empire."
p. 218.

"*Sublatum iri ex orbe
imperium, nomenque
Romanum.*" Lactant.
Institut. l. vii. 15. note 5.

GIBBON.

mities were denounced
against an unbelieving
world. A regular series
was prepared of all the
moral and physical evils
which can affect a flou-
rishing nation; all these
were only so many pre-
paratory and alarming
signs of the great cata-
strophe of Rome," &c.
p. 472.

"*Lactantius (Institut.
Divin. vii. 15. &c.)* relates the dismal tales of futuri-
ty with great spirit and eloquence." note 66. c. xv.

III.

What our author has urged, as the objections of
the Gnostics to the Mosaic law, is abstracted from
Beausobre. I shall produce some of the parallel
passages, which it is obvious are copied. He does
indeed refer to him on this occasion *.

BEAUSOBRE.

"Nos Hérétiques—
trouvoient, que Moïse
& les Prophètes avoient
eu

GIBBON.

"*The God of Israel
was impiously represented†
by the Gnostics, as a being
liable*

* Our author thus indirectly acknowledges his obligation,
"Beausobre, Histoire du Manichéisme, l. i. c. 3. has stated their
objections, particularly those of Faustus, the adversary of Au-
gustin, with the most learned impartiality." note 25. c. xv.

† Notwithstanding Mr. G. has added the epithet *impiously*,
it is plain from the words with which he introduces these objec-
tions of the Gnostics, that he is no more a friend to the Mosaic
dispensation

BEAUSOBRE.

eu de fausses idées des perfections divines: qu'ils avoient attribué à Dieu des passions tres-indignes de lui, la *colère*, la *vengéance*, la *jalousie*, le *repentir*." p. 286. 287.

" Ils jugeoient de même de l'ordre, que *Moïse* donne aux Israélites de *massacrer les peuples de Canaan*, sans épargner ni âge, ni sexe. Ils concluoient de là, que le Dieu de l'Hébreux n'étoit pas le vrai Dieu, ou que leurs prophètes n'étoient pas de véritables prophètes, ou enfin que leurs livres avoient été corrompus par les Juifs." p. 271.

" Nos hérétiques censurent ensuite, avec une liberté audacieuse & profane, diverses loix Mosaiques." p. 272, 273.
" Les promesses temporelles du V. Testament ouvroient

GIBBON.

liable to passion and to error, capricious in his favour, *implacable* in his resentment, meanly *jealous* of his superstitious worship, and confining his partial providence to a single people, and to this transitory life." p. 460.

" The conquest of the land of Canaan, and the extirpation of the unsuspecting natives, they were at a loss how to reconcile with the common notions of humanity and justice: when they recollected the *sanguinary list* of murders, of executions, and of *massacres*, which stain almost every page of the Jewish annals," &c. p. 459.

" Passing from the sectaries of the law to the law itself, they asserted that it was impossible that a religion which consisted only of bloody sacrifices and *trifling ceremonies*,

dispensation than they were. " There are some objection," says he, " against the authority of Moses and the prophets, " which too readily present themselves to the sceptical mind," &c. " These objections were eagerly embraced, and as petulantly urged by the vain science of the Gnostics." p. 459.

BEAUMOBRE.

ouvroient aux hérétiques une vaste carrière de médisances contre ce livre sacré, ou plutôt contre le Dieu des Israélites." p. 274. § 4. See also § 6. p. 277.

"Ces hérétiques n'avoient que de l'horreur pour les sacrifices, & du mépris pour toutes les cérémonies Judaïques, soutenant, qu'il étoit impossible, que le vrai Dieu eût jamais ordonné un tel culte.—Mais pour les sacrifices sanglans, ils étoient persuadés, qu'il n'y avoit que les démons qui les exigeassent *." p. 276, 277.

"Entre ces turpitudes Judaïques, il n'y en avoit point qui les choquoit davantage que la circoncision." Sect. 6. p. 277.

"Ces Hérétiques s'étant fait un système de la création du monde, de la tentation, & de la chute d'*Adam* très-différent de celui de Moïse, ils exerçoient leur critique sur les trois premiers chapitres de la Genèse, dans

GIBBON.

monies, and whose rewards as well as punishments were all of a carnal and temporal nature, could inspire the love of virtue, or restrain the impetuosity of passion." p. 460.

"A variety of trivial though burthensome observances, were so many objects of disgust and aversion for other nations," &c. p. 454.

"The painful and even dangerous rite of circumcision was alone capable of repelling a willing proselyte from the door of the synagogue." P. 454.

"The Mosaic account of the creation and fall of man was treated with profane derision by the Gnostics, who would not listen with patience to the repose of the Deity after six

* See these objections answered, § 7. p. 278, 279.

BEAUSOBRE.

dans lesquels ils prétendoient trouver quantité d'absurditez. Cependant leurs objections sont évidemment frivoles." P. 280. Sect. 8.

See also p. 281.

"Les trois premiers chapitres de la Genèse, qui contiennent l'Histoire de la Creation du Monde, celle d'Adam & d'Eve, de leur tentation & de leur péché, ont toujours fait beaucoup de peine aux interprètes de l'Ecriture, soit Juifs ou Chrétiens. Un auteur moderne * qui a beaucoup d'esprit & de savoir, mais qui pense d'une manière qui paroît un peu trop libre, n'a pas dissimulé ces difficultez. Je ne parle à present que de celles qui se présentent dans l'histoire de la tentation †."

Is it not surprising, that Mr. G. as an Englishman, should know nothing of *Burnet's Archæologia* but from the works of a foreigner?

"Ils déclamoient contre les plus illustres patriarches, dont ils rélévoient les défauts avec la malignité la plus in-

GIBBON.

six days labour, to the rib of Adam, the garden of Eden, the trees of life and knowledge, the speaking serpent, the forbidden fruit, and the eternal condemnation pronounced against human-kind for the venial offence of the first progenitors." P. 460.

Our author makes a similar remark in a note (27. c. xv.)

"Dr. Burnet (*Archæologia*, l. ii. c. 7.) has discussed the first chapters of *Genesis* with too much wit and freedom."

"As those hereticks were, for the most part, averse to the pleasures of sense, they morosely arraigned the polygamy of

* Thom. Burnet, *Archæologia*, l. ii. 7. † Livr. vii. c. 3. sect. 1.

BEAUSOBRE.

insolente." p. 273.

In a note in this passage we have the following words:

" On peut voir au long les declamations de *Fauste*. — l. 22. 5. 32. 4. Et quos maxime Entheos credas, millenis & centenis volutari cum scortis, tanquam *David & Solomon*."

GIBBON.

of the patriarchs, the gallantries of David, and the seraglio of Solomon." p. 459.

IV.

" Que quand il seroit vrai, que *Moïse*, & les prophètes des Juifs, auroient prédit le Seigneur; leur témoignage ne pouvoit servir, qu'à la conversion des Juifs qui reconnoissent leur autorité." § 9. p. 282.

" Les pères — gênez par de faux principes, ont nié quelquefois ce qu'il falloit avouer, avoué ce qu'il falloit nier: Et alors, ne pouvant se tirer des difficultez, qu'en tordant les ecritures, & en recourant à de misérables allégories, ils trahissoient, pour ainsi dire, la cause qu'ils vouloient défendre." c. iv. § 1.

" Ils éludent les objections par de frivoles allegories." p. 284.

" Their favourite argument (of prophecy) might serve to edify a Christian, or to convert a Jew, since both the one and the other acknowledge the authority of those prophecies, and both are obliged, with devout reverence, to search for their sense and their accomplishment. But this mode of persuasion loses much of its weight and influence, when it is addressed to those who neither understand nor respect the Mosaic dispensation and the prophetic style. In the unskilful hands of Justin, and of the succeeding apologists, the sublime meaning of the Hebrew oracles evaporates in distant

GIBBON.

distant types, affected conceits and cold allegories.”
p. 517.

BEAUSOBRE.

“ St. *Augustin* cède visiblement la victoire aux Manichéens : il leur abandonne *Moïse* & le Vieux Testament lorsqu’il avouë, qu’il n’y a pas moyen de conserver le sens littéral des trois premiers chapitres de la *Génèse* sans blesser la piété, sans attribuer à Dieu des choses indignes de lui ; qu’il faut absolument, pour sauver *Moïse* & son histoire, recourir à l’*Allégorie*. On passe les allégories, qui laissent subsister le sens littéral, mais on ne souffre point celles qui le détruisent, à moins qu’il ne s’agisse de paraboles, & non d’histoires.” p. 285. § 4.

“ Il faut pourtant excuser S. *Augustin* ; il ne fait que suivre l’exemple d’*Origène*,” &c. § 5.

See also § 6.

GIBBON.

“ The most learned of the Fathers, by a very singular condescension, have imprudently admitted the sophistry of the Gnostics. *Acknowledging that the literal sense is repugnant to every principle of faith as well as reason*, they deem themselves secure and invulnerable behind the ample veil of *allegory*, which they carefully spread over every tender part of the Mosaic dispensation.” p. 460.

See also page 565.

Mr. G. here adds this note.

“ See Beausobre Hist. du Manichéisme, l. i. c. 4. *Origen* and *St. Augustin* were among the allegorists.”

V.

“ Ce que *Fauste* trouve étrange dans le système catholique, c’est que des Chrétiens,

“ The condemnation of the wisest and most virtuous of the pagans, on

Q

BEAUSOBRE.

GIBBON.

Chrétiens, qui sortoient d'entre les Gentils, accordassent la vie éternelle aux pères des Hébreux, & la refusassent à leurs propres ancêtres.

“ Ce qui me choque dans votre sentiment, dit encore ce Manichéen, ce n'est pas que notre libérateur ait déployé sa grace sur les pères des Juifs, mais c'est qu'il ne l'ait déployée que sur eux, & non

sur les pères des Gentils, quoique la plus grande partie de l'Eglise Chrétienne descende de ces derniers, & non d'Abraham, d'Isaac, & de Jacob.” p. 291.

“ Plusieurs des pères considéroient l'esprit, la raison humaine, comme une rayon, comme une lumière, qui sort du VERBE, ou de la raison divine, & qui éclaire généralement tous les hommes. C'est ce qui a fait dire à “ Justin Martyr ” que “ le Christ a été conçu en partie de Socrate, parce que le Christ est le verbe, & que le verbe est dans tous les hommes.” Et ailleurs, “ Nous avons dit ci de-

on account of their ignorance or disbelief of the divine truth seems to offend the reason and the humanity of the present age. But the primitive church, whose faith was of a much firmer consistence, delivered over, without hesitation, to eternal torture, the far greater part of the human species.” p. 473.

“ A charitable hope might perhaps be indulged in favour of Socrates, or some other sages of antiquity, who had consulted the light of reason before that of the Gospel had arisen.” p. 473.

“ Justin and Clemens of Alexandria allow, that some of the philosophers were instructed by the Logos; confounding its double signification, of the human reason, and of the divine word.” note 69. c. xv.

“ vant

BEAUSOBRE.

“vant, que le *Christ* étant le *verbe*, tous le genre
 “humain y participe. *Car tous ceux, qui vivent*
 “selon la raison, sont *Chrétiens*. Tels ont été parmi
 “les Grecs Socrate, Héraclite,” &c. p. 307.

Justin Mart. Apolog. Clemens Alexandrin. is
 also quoted here.

VI.

BEAUSOBRE.

“Ces gens-là croy-
 oient, que le péché d’
 Adam a été l’inconti-
 nence : que l’amour
 charnel, quelque réglé
 qu’il soit, n’est point in-
 nocent : qu’il a été la
 cause de la mort, & des
 douleurs de la mort :
 Que si l’homme étoit
 demeuré vierge : si la
 partie de lumière, qui est
 en lui, n’avoit point été
 souillée de la concupis-
 cence, elle se seroit sé-
 parée de la matière sans
 difficulté.—Divers pères
 ont donné aveuglement
 dans le piège, que les
 hérétiques leur avoient
 tendu *.—Un grand
 nombre de Chrétiens, qui
 s’imaginèrent, que la
 perfection evangelique
 les appelloit à renoncer au mariage : Que des toutes

GIBBON.

“It was their favour-
 ite opinion, that if Adam
 had preserved his obedi-
 ence to the Creator, he
 would have lived for ever
 in a state of virgin puri-
 ty, and that some harm-
 less mode of vegetation
 might have peopled Pa-
 radise with a race of in-
 nocent and immortal be-
 ings.” p. 484.

“Since desire was im-
 puted as a crime, and
 marriage was tolerated
 as a defect, it was con-
 sistent with the same
 principles to consider a
 state of celibacy as the
 nearest approach to the
 divine perfection.” p.
 485.

* Liv. ii. c. vi. p. 414.

BEAUSOBRE.

les vertus il n'y en a point de plus sublime, de plus angélique, de plus divine, que celle de surmonter des desirs naturels *."

VII.

BEAUSOBRE.

" Ces fabuleux écrivains ont voulu persuader au monde, que tous les apôtres avoient souffert le martyre, ce qui n'est apparemment point vrai, & ce qui n'est nullement nécessaire à la religion."

p. 415.

See his note on this passage, where he quotes Clemens.

GIBBON.

" If indeed we were disposed to adopt the traditions of a too credulous antiquity, we might relate the distant peregrinations, the wonderful achievements, and the various deaths of the twelve apostles." p. 531.

" In the time of Tertullian and Clemens of Alexandria, the glory of martyrdom was confined to St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. James." note 27. c. xvi.

VIII.

" Le pères s'éleverent avec véhémence contre un sentiment, qui n'étoit propre qu'à décourager les martyrs, & à les flétrir. Ils accusèrent même Basilide, d'enseigner que c'est une folie de souffrir le martyre, & qu'il vaut mieux renoncer Jésus-Christ †." See also

" It should seem that some of these Gnostics (the Basilidians) declined, and even refused, the honour of martyrdom. Their reasons were singular and abstruse." c. xv. note 33.

c. iii. § 14. p. 41.

* C. vii. § 7. p. 424.

† Liv. iv. c. ii. p. 25, 26.

IX.

BEAUSOBRE.

" S. Irenée dit que *Basilide mit au rang des choses indifférentes les plus sales débauches: & S. Epiphane, qu'il n'y a point de vices, point d'impudicités, qu'il ne permit à ses disciples.* Epargnons au lecteur un plus grand nombre de citations *." Iren. Epiph. Hær. 24.

" De tout tems les sectes rivales se sont mutuellement accusées de *mystères profanes* ou ridicules. Les payens en ont accusé les Juifs, les Juifs en accuserent les Chrétiens, & publièrent par-tout, *que les incestes d'Oedipe, & les Festins de Thyeste, étoient leurs cérémonies sacrées. Les Chrétiens rejetterent ces crimes sur les Gnostiques †.*"

" Il y eut beaucoup de licence dans certains mystères du paganisme. Mais

GIBBON.

" It was sometimes faintly insinuated, and sometimes boldly asserted, that the same bloody sacrifices, and the same incestuous festivals, which were so falsely ascribed to the orthodox believers, *were in reality celebrated by the Marcionites, by the Carpocratians, and by several other sects of the Gnostics, who, notwithstanding they might deviate into the paths of heresy, were still actuated by the sentiments of men, and still governed by the precepts of Christianity †.* Accusations of a similar kind were retorted upon the church by the schismatics, who had departed from its communion," &c.

" But the perusal of the ancient apologies was sufficient to remove even the

* Livr. iv. c. iii. § 15.

† Mr. G. thus cites Beausobre in this place, " M. de Beausobre (Hist. du Manichéisme, l. ix. c. 8, 9.) has exposed with great spirit the disingenuous arts of Augustin and pope Leo I." but I appeal to my reader if this is a sufficient acknowledgment of his great obligations.

† Liv. ix. c. viii. § 2.

BEAUSOBRE:

Mais ces infidèles, bien loin de croire en J. Christ, ne connoissoient ni lui, ni sa doctrine, ou ne les connoissoient que pour les condamner. Le Manichéen *croit en J. Christ*. — Il reçoit l'évangile & l'apôtre; (S. Paul) — S'il rejette quelques endroits de ces livres sacrez, ces endroits ne concernent point la morale; — *pour les preceptes*, ils en reconnoissent la justice, la beauté, la perfection, & *sont consister l'essentiel de la religion à les suivre*. Cela est-il compatible avec des prostitutions érigées en parties du culte divin ?”

“ Cette methode de défendre les Manichéens est la même dont les apologistes des Chrétiens se servoient pour se justifier des faux crimes dont les payens les accusoient. Ne citons que le seul *Athenagore*. “ Afin d'avoir des prétextes de nous persécuter, on nous accuse, dit ce philosophe

GIBBON:

the slightest suspicion from the mind of a candid adversary. The Christians urge with equal truth and propriety, that the charge is not less devoid of probability, than it is destitute of evidence; they ask, whether any one can seriously believe that *the pure and holy precepts of the Gospel, which so frequently restrain the use of the most lawful enjoyments, should inculcate the practice of the most abominable crimes*; that a large society should resolve to dishonour itself in the eyes of its own members; and that a great number of persons of either sex, and every age and character, insensible to the fear of death or infamy, should consent to *violate those principles* which nature and education had imprinted most deeply in their minds. *Nothing, it should seem, could weaken the force or destroy the effect of so unanswerable*

* Liv. ix. c. viii. § 2.

BEAUSOBRE.

“ Iosophe Athénien, de
 “ faire des Festins détesta-
 “ bles, & de commettre des
 “ incestes dans nos assem-
 “ blées.” — Athenagore
 fait voir ensuite, que
 “ les principes & les
 “ Mœurs des Chrétiens
 “ suffisoient seuls pour dé-
 “ truire les calomnies qu’
 “ on répandoit contr’
 “ eux. — Que des gens qui
 “ s’abstenoient des voluptez permises parmi toutes
 “ les nations, ne se livroient pas à des voluptez
 “ que toutes les nations condamnoient. — D’où il
 “ s’ensuit qu’ils étoient innocens des crimes qu’on
 “ leur imputoit.” p. 732.

GIBBON.

answerable a justification,
unless it were the inju-
dicious conduct of the apo-
logists themselves, who
 betrayed the common
 cause of religion, to
 gratify their devout
 hatred to the domestic
 enemies of the church.”
 p. 527—529.

X.

Compare what this
 author says, on Vigils,
 and their abuse.

“ Ces dévotions noc-
 turnes ne pouvoient a-
 voir que des mauvais
 suites.—ce qui obligea
 le Concile d’Elvire en
 Espagne, de défendre
 aux femmes de s’y trou-
 ver. Il fallut les inter-
 dire entièrement dans la
 suite.” p. 666. Concil.
 Elib. Can. 35.

See also what he says
 of their abuse of the Agapæ, p. 635.

See the similar obser-
 vation and reference of
 Mr. G.

“ The 35th canon of
 the council of Illiberis
 provides against the
 scandals which too of-
 ten polluted the vigils
 of the church, and dis-
 graced the Christian
 name, in the eyes of
 unbelievers.” Note 22.
 c. xvi.

XI.

BEAUSOBRE.

“ Les Chrétiens religieux observateurs de tous les devoirs de l'humanité, & de la charité, ils n'avoient garde de négliger celui d'ensevelir les morts. C'est même à cela que Julien attribue en partie les progrès du Christianisme. “ Rien n'a

“ plus attribué aux progrès de l'impie Chrétienne,” dit ce prince apostat, “ que la charité des Chrétiens pour les étrangers, l'empressement qu'ils avoient de donner la sépulture aux morts, & les fausses apparences de sainteté qui éclatoient dans toute leur conduite*.” Julian. Ep. 49.

GIBBON.

“ A generous intercourse of charity united the most distant provinces, such an institution, which paid less regard to the merit than to the distress of the object, very materially conduced to the progress of Christianity. The Pagans, who were actuated by a sense of humanity, while they derided the doctrines, acknowledged the benevolence of the new sect.” p. 498.

“ Julian (epist. 49.) seems mortified, that the Christian charity maintains not only their own, but likewise the heathen poor.” note 141. c. xv,

XII.

Consult liv. ii. c. i. with respect to the epistle of Abgarus.

Compare this with what our author says of the legend of Abgarus, note 179. c. xv.

XIII.

* Page 639. The observation that Beausobre makes on this occasion shews a very different turn of mind from that of our author. He says, “ Ce fut effectivement à des vertus, non feintes, mais réelles, que la religion du Sauveur fut redevable en partie de

XIII.

Compare Beaufobre's Remark on the disputes between the Jew Orobio and Limborch, and his quotation of the *Amica Collatio* *; with Mr. G.'s observation on that subject, and his reference to that treatise †.

I surely need not again remind my reader, how evident it is that our author shines with learning not his own; as a planet owes its light to the effulgence of a superior luminary.

Instances of Plagiarism from DODWELL.

Of all the learned moderns, from whom Mr. G. has purloined his citations of the ancients, there is not one perhaps who has been of more general use to him than Dodwell: whose treatise *on the small number of martyrs*, has furnished our author with almost every fact he relates, and every observation he makes, in executing the design of his sixteenth chapter; "to separate a few authentic as well as interesting facts from an undigested mass of fiction and error, and to relate, in a clear and rational manner, the causes, the extent, the duration, and the most important circumstances of the persecutions to which the first Christians were exposed ‡."

de ses accroissemens."—"Ce temoignage de Julien fait beaucoup d'honneur aux Chrétiens . . . Car s'il traite la sainteté & la pureté de leurs mœurs, d'*hypocrisie*, on voit bien que c'est la haine & le préjugé, qui lui en font porter ce jugement."

* Page 438. § 2.

† Page 455. 466. note 14. c. xv.

‡ Page 520.

It would perhaps make no improper beginning, were I to point out the similarity which discovers itself in the *motives* which both *Dodwell* and *Gibbon* assign as *incitements to martyrdom*; but I have already observed, how proper a compliment our author pays to *Dodwell* and *Middleton* on this occasion*, which may, in some measure, atone for the great liberty he has taken in transcribing their remarks at large on this subject. I shall only add, that Mr. G. might as well have referred us to the xi. dissertation of *Dodwell*; for he has taken, to my certain knowledge, more of these reflections from that, than from the xii. and xiii. Neither needed he have been ashamed, after quoting the two dissertations by wholesale, to have added a third to the number, though it is a little extensive †.

I.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

“ Sed de *paucitate*
primævorum martyrum
disertissimum habemus
Origenis testimonium,
 quod miror hætenus à
 nemine, quod sciam,
 esse animadversum. Ολι-

γος

“ The learned Origen, who, from his experience as well as reading, was intimately acquainted with the history of the Christians, declares, in the most express

* See p. 550, 551. and note 89. c. xvi.

† This is a practice which our author has frequently adopted, and a good artifice it is to escape detection. I have already noticed one instance in his quoting *Grotius*; without any distinction of his voluminous works. I shall here give another instance. At note 135. c. xv. he speaks of “ a rescript of Diocletian, “ which,” says he, “ is only a declaration of an old law.” We have no reference at all to inform us where this law is to be found. We may find it however, after turning over a few pages of the Codex Theodosian, lib. vi. tit. 24. l. 8. This is much the same, as if a divine should tell us of a *verse* of St. Paul’s without quoting the epistle and chapter.

DODWELL.

γοι (inquit) κατα και-
 ρος και σφοδρα ευαριθμη-
 τοι υπερ της των χριστια-
 νων θεοσεβειας τεθνηκασι *.

Contr. Cels. l. iii. p.
 116.

Origen advers. Celsum. l. iii. p. 116 †.

GIBBON.

express terms, that the
 number of martyrs was
 very inconsiderable †.

“ His words deserve
 to be transcribed. Ολι-
 γοι κατα καιρος, και σφο-
 δρα ευαριθμητοι περι των
 χριστιανων θεοσεβειας τεθ-

Have I not here the reason to put the old ques-
 tion to our author, “*Tuumne obsecro? vetus credi-
 di.*” Can we hesitate a moment to determine
 the source of his information? Or can we think
 that Mr. G. would have known that there were any
 words in Origen that *deserved to be transcribed*, un-
 less he had found them already quoted to his hands
 in Dodwell?

It is a pity, however, that our author was so
 inaccurate in transcribing this passage. If we could
 possibly imagine that one, who makes such a parade
 of Greek quotations, could be unacquainted with
 the abbreviations which are decyphered in every
 Greek grammar, this would account for his mis-
 taking the contraction $\omega\epsilon\rho$, as printed in Dod-
 well, for $\omega\epsilon$, which absolutely destroys the
 sense, and for omitting the particle τ , which is al-
 so necessary to complete it. But as Dodwell has
 inserted the article των more than we find in Ori-
 gen, which appears also in Mr. G.’s Greek quota-
 tion, it sets the matter beyond all doubt.

* Dissertat. xi. § vii. p. 227.

† Page 546.

‡ Note 71. c. xvi.

II.

We meet with the same *general* reflections respecting the persecutions, in Mr. Dodwell and Mr. G. That not only the most *distinguished* persons among the *Christians*, but even *women* and *slaves* were crowned with martyrdom: "*Felicitas* and *Perpetua*, and, among the martyrs of Lyons, the *slave Blandina*," are examples singled out by both*. They mention the *indifference*, nay even the *favour*, shewn by some of the *emperors* towards the *Christians*†. They have the same quotation from *Tertullian* to shew that *Trajan* frustrated in some degree the laws enacted against the *Christians*, "*quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est*, Apolog. c. 5. ‡" They both inform us, that *Trajan* restrained "*the popular clamours*, which condemned the *Christians* to the lions;" that he forbade the magistrates to make search after the *Christians*; that, by the edicts of *Hadrian* and *Antoninus Pius*, those informers, who falsely accused men as being *Christians*, suffered in their stead: And reference is made by each to "the *Apology of Melito* apud *Euseb.* l. iv. c. 26. and to *Justin* Apolog. ii. §"—Hence they both draw a general inference, that many of the persecutions which arose in the provinces were owing to the disposition of the governors: In describing these persecutions, the same kinds of punishment are specified by each of these writers ||.

* Compare Dodwell Dissertat. xi. sect. v. with Gibbon, p. 546. and note 70. c. xvi.

† See Dodwell, sect. viii. x. Gibbon, p. 555. 541, 542.

‡ Dodwell, sect. viii. Gibbon, note 58. c. xvi.

§ Consult Dodwell, sect. ix. x. See also sect. xl. p. 267. See Gibbon, p. 541—543. Notes 59. 61. c. xvi.

|| Dodwell, sect. 8. 38. Gibbon, p. 543. 545.

After

After these general reflections, Mr. Dodwell descends to a particular examination of the several persecutions and martyrdoms which happened under the reigns of the emperors, as they succeeded respectively to the throne. Sect. 13. "Age itaque breviter percurramus has, quas ita *sanguinarias* existimant *persecutiones*." The following instances will shew, that in this part of his history at least, Mr. G. chiefly consulted the original materials, which the learning of Mr. Dodwell had stored up.

III.

We find in Dodwell's account of Nero's persecution, on the authority of Tacitus, the great number of the Christians expressed by the words "ingens multitudo." The religion styled "exilis abilis superstitio,"—the effects of the persecution confined to the walls of Rome*. These are circumstances which particularly distinguish Mr. G.'s description †.

IV.

Mr. D. says of the persecution of Domitian, "The persecution of Domitian (if it deserves that epithet) was of no long duration §," &c. potent ‡."

Compare what Mr. G. says of the execution of *Clemens* the Consul, by Domitian, and the banishment of *Domitilla*, for *Atbeism* and *Jewish manners*, together with a great number of other persons ||; and his reference to Eusebius iii. 18. and to

* Sect. 13. † P. 509. 532, &c. note 34. 165. c. xvi.

‡ Sect. 16. p. 236.

§ Page 539.

|| Page 539.

Dion,—

Dion *,—with Mr. Dodwell's words, and quotation of Eusebius, iii. 18. †

V.

Mr. G. has introduced the above account with a story about the grandsons of St. Jude, which he tells us, is taken from *Hegefippus*. But the reader will be inclined to think he took it from Dodwell.

DODWELL.

“Consentit cum *Tertulliano*, de hac *Domitiani*, mutatione, *Hegefippus*. Cum enim in *Davidicam* familiam ille inquisivisset, & pro locupletibus metuendisque pauperes illos spernendosque reperisset; illum hujus inquisitionis eventum ita describit *Hegefippus*, *Domitianum* ελευθερος μεν αυτης ανειναι, καταπαυσαι δε δια τῆ προσταγματος του κατα της εκκλησιας διωγμον. Euseb. iii. 20.

GIBBON.

“Among the Christians, who were brought before the tribunal of the emperor,—were the grandsons of St. Jude the apostle.—Their natural pretensions to the throne of David, might perhaps attract the respect of the people, and excite the jealousy of the governor; but the meanness of their garb, and the simplicity of their answers, soon convinced him that they were neither desirous nor capable of disturbing the peace of the Roman empire.—The grandsons of St. Jude were dismissed with compassion and contempt †.” “Euseb. iii. 20. The story is taken from *Hegefippus* §.”

* Note 52. c. xvi.

† Page 538.

† Dodwell, sect. 16.

§ Note 49. c. xvi.

VI.

DODWELL.

" Jam si *Lactantium* audimus, à *Domitiano* ad *Decium* usque nulla erat omnino persecutio. Ita enim ille: "*Rescissis igitur actis tyranni* ||, non modo in statum pristinum ecclesia restituta est, sed etiam multo clarius ac floridius enituit.—Sed enim postea longa pax rupta est. *Exstitit enim, post annos plurimos, execrabile animal Decius, qui vexaret ecclesiam* *." Lactant. de mort. persecut. c. 3, 4.

GIBBON.

" The condition (of the Christians) ever since the time of Domitian, was represented as a state of perfect freedom and security, if compared with the rigorous treatment which they experienced under the short reign of Decius †."

" Lactantius, de Mortibus Persecutorum, c. 3, 4. After celebrating the felicity and increase of the church, under a long succession of good princes; he adds, "*Exstitit post annos plurimos, execrabile animal, Decius, qui vexaret ecclesiam* ‡."

VII.

In sect. 25, 26. Mr. D. makes several observations which correspond with those of our author, " on the conduct and character of Pliny, and on the praise bestowed on him by Tertullian for his fair and honourable testimony §."

|| This particular expression is closely translated by Mr. G. p. 540. He says, " The memory of Domitian was condemned by the senate, *his acts were rescinded,*" &c.

* Sect. 17. page 238.

† Page 560.

‡ Note 120. c. xvi. § P. 507. 540. notes 15. 23. c. xvi.

VIII.

VIII.

We come now to the state of the Christians, in the reign of *Commodus*, which our authors thus describe.

DODWELL.

"Sub *Commodo* pacem ecclesiæ fuisse diuorov testis est illorum temporum scriptor *Asterius Urbanus* *, quam pacem cunctas orbis ecclesias complexam esse scribit *Eusebius* †. Nempe *Marciam Christianorum* fuisse patronam ait, *Dione* suo fortasse auctore, *Xiphilinus* ‡. *Xiphilin.* in *Commodo*.

GIBBON.

"The Christians were protected by the lenity of *Commodus*. The celebrated *Marcia* entertained a singular affection for the oppressed church, and declared herself the patroness of the Christians §."

In a note our author refers to "Dion Cassius, or rather, his abbreviator *Xiphilin.* l. lxxii. p. 1206." ||

IX.

The next persecution was that of *Severus*, of which we have this account.

"Quintam deinde persecutionem *Severo* tribuunt *Eusebius*, &c.—Nec tamen illam ipsam inchoatam putant ante X. ejus annum.—Tempus enim notavit

"Nor was the peace of the church interrupted, till the increasing numbers of proselytes seem at length to have attracted the attention, and

* Ap. *Euseb. Hist.* v. 16.† *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v. 21.‡ *Sect.* 40.

§ Page 557.

|| Note 106. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

notavit accuratissime in Severi vita Spartianus.—

“In itinere Palæstinis plurima jura fundavit.

“*Judeos fieri sub gravi*

“*pœna vetuit. Idem etiam*

“*de Christianis sanxit* *.”

“Est etiam id observatione dignum, *Christianos fieri duntaxat vetuisse Severum*, nihil autem esse quo jam *factos* posset colligi ejus esse jussu puniendos †.

“*Populi itaque potius quam Severi furore nata hæc videtur persecutio, & quanquam cessit populo in emittendo persecutionis decreto, restitit tamen eidem in os Christianos amicos ad supplicium poscenti.*—“*Populo furenti in os palam restitit;*” ut ait Tertulianus ad Scap. c. 4.

and to have alienated the mind, of Severus. With the design of restraining the progress of Christianity, he published an edict, which, *though it was designed to affect only the new converts*, could not be carried into strict execution, without exposing to danger and punishment the most zealous of their teachers and missionaries ‡.

“*Judeos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit. Idem etiam de Christianis sanxit.*” Hist. August. p. 70. §

“Under the reign of Severus, *the fury of the populace was checked*; the rigour of antient laws was for some time suspended,” &c ‖.

Compare Mr. D.’s remark at this place, that the Christians often suffered with the Jews, as the heathens made little distinction between them **,—and Mr. G.’s observations, p. 530. 537. 538. Each of them notice the same passage of Suetonius ††.

* Spartian. Sever. c. 16, 17. sect. 40.

† Sect. 46.

‡ Page 558.

§ Note 110. c. xvi.

‖ P. 557.

** Sect. 42.

†† Dodwell, sect. 42. and Gibbon,

note 25. xvi.

R

Mr.

Mr. G. gives us no account of the persecution of Severus, which Dodwell ingeniously acknowledges*.

X.

With regard to Caracalla we read as follows.

DODWELL.

" Jam Caracalla tempora ut aliis fuerint cruentissima, at Christianis certe prorsus aversa fuisse verisimilimum est. " *Lacte Christiano educatum,*" ait Tertullianus." ad Scap. c. 4.

See what he observes of the peaceable; nay friendly disposition of the successors of Severus, towards the Christians †.

GIBBON.

" The nurse as well as the preceptor of Caracalla were Christians; and if that young prince ever betrayed a sentiment of humanity, it was occasioned by an accident, which, however trifling, bore some relation to the cause of Christianity ‡."

Compare the life of Caracalla in the Augustan history, with the epistle of Tertullian to Scapula §."

XI.

We come next to Alexander Severus.

DODWELL.

" Ab illa Severi xxxviii. annorum intervallum interponit Sulpicius. Recte nimirum ille, pro communi sententia, modo decadem, quæ intercidit reponas," &c. ||

" Nec sane aliter tam longa

GIBBON.

" But the laws which Severus had enacted, soon expired with the authority of that emperor; and the Christians, after this accidental tempest, enjoyed a calm of thirty-eight years**."

" Sul-

* Sect. 43. 44.

§ Note 107. c. xvi.

† Sect. 47.

|| Sect. 52.

‡ Page 557.

** Page 558.

DODWELL.

longa illa fuisset pax, de qua meminit in libro de lapsis, Cyprianus," &c*.

"Quam vero *amicum Christianis* fuerit *Alexandri* imperium, abunde manifestum est. *Christianis* ille publicum locum occupantibus in *ecclesie* usum concessit. Idem *Christianos* in munerum publicorum dispositione sibi in exemplum proposuit. Idem *Christum* in *larario* majore sanctioreque habuit, quod nullos tamen nisi divos optimosque & consecratos complecteretur. Idem *Christo templum* facere voluit, eumque inter *Deos* recipere †."

E scriptore suorum temporum. Hist. August. c. 29. 31. c. 43. 51. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 21.

"Sed & *Mamma* mater (cui nimium in reipub. administratione permissum esse queruntur,)—ipsa quoque *Christiana* fuit, & *Origenem* accer-

GIBBON.

"Sulpicius Severus, l. ii. p. 384."

"This computation (allowing for a single exception) is confirmed by the history of *Eusebius*, and by the writings of *Cyprian* †."

"They were now permitted to erect and consecrate convenient edifices for the purpose of religious worship; to purchase lands, even at Rome itself, for the use of the community; and to conduct the election of their ecclesiastical ministers in so public, but at the same time in so exemplary a manner, as to deserve the respectful attention of the Gentiles. The emperor Alexander adopted their method of publicly proposing the names of those persons who were candidates for ordination," &c.

See the Augustan history, p. 130. ||

Afterwards we read, "The sentiments of *Mamma*

* Sect. 48. See also sect. ix. p. 229.

† Sect. 47.

‡ Note 111. c. xvi.

§ Page 558.

|| Note 223. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

accesavit ut ab eo in doctrina Christi erudiretur. Ea cum ita se haberent, non erat quod Christiani metuerent, sive a plebium tumultibus, sive etiam à præfectis provinciarum," &c.

GIBBON.

Mammæa were adopted by her son Alexander. In his domestic chapel he placed the statues of Abraham, of Orpheus, of Apollonius, and of *Christ* *."

See the Augustan history, p. 123 †.

"When the empress

Mammæa passed through Antioch, she expressed a desire of conversing with the celebrated Origen, the fame of whose piety and learning was spread over the east. Origen obeyed so flattering an invitation," &c. † Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 21. Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. c. 54. §

XII.

The conduct of the emperor *Maximin* is thus represented by our two authors.

DODWELL.

"In odium *Philipporum* persecutus est *Decius*, in odium *Alexandri Maximinus* ||."

"Successit deinde *Alexandro Maximinus* — Hanc in ecclesiarum sacerdotes factam a *Maximino*, ait *Eusebius*. — *Orosius* persecutionem hanc in

GIBBON.

"After the death of Alexander, when the inhuman *Maximin* discharged his fury on the favourites and servants of his unfortunate benefactor, a great number of Christians, of every rank and of both sexes, were involved in the promiscuous

* Page 559

† Mr. G. always refers to the page, not to the chapter, of the Augustan history; another way of disguising favours received. It is a pity he did not alter the reference to *Eusebius*, and not suffer it to stand the same in his quotation, as in *Dodwell's*.

‡ Page 559.

§ Note 114. c. xvi.

|| Sect. 10.

DODWELL.

in *Sacerdotes & Clericos*, i. e. *doctores*, motam esse tradit.—Præcipue propter *Origenem* presbyterum persecutionem hanc a *Maximino* esse concitatam,” &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 28.

“Ita non ad multos pertinebat illa persecutio.—Cui etiam consentit *Firmilianus*, quod persecutio illa non per totum mundum, sed localis fuisset, si tamen de eadem persecutione sit intelligendus *.” Sulp. Sever. Sacr. Hist. l. 2. *Firmilianus* Ep. apud Cyprian. 75.

“Necesse erat hanc persecutionem omnino fuisse brevissimam †.”

GIBBON.

cuous massacre, which, on their account, has improperly received the name of persecution.” Eusebius, l. vi. c. 28 †.

“Notwithstanding the cruel disposition of Maximin, the effects of his resentment against the Christians were of a very local and temporary nature, and the pious *Origen*, who had been proscribed as a devoted victim, was still reserved to convey the truths of the Gospel to the ear of monarchs §.”

“Orosius, l. vii. c. 19. mentions Origen as the object of Maximin’s resentment; and *Firmilianus* a Cappadocian bishop of that age, gives a just and confined idea of this persecution (apud Cyprian. epist. 75.) ||”

* Sect. 48. As I have before censured Mr. G.’s quotation of Firmilianus, it is proper to observe that my charge does not affect Mr. Dodwell, as he speaks of this persecution, not with that confined idea in which our author represents it, as relating *only* to bishops and priests; but as extending itself to the Christians *in general* (sect. 51) However closely Mr. G. copies the dissertation, he seldom is so liberal as to specify facts that make against his hypothesis.

† Sect. 49.

‡ Note 116. c. xvi.

§ Page 559.

|| Note 117. c. xvi.

XIII.

The severe persecution of *Decius* is the next in order.

DODWELL.

Iniquissimi quidem illi, ut longe alium nobis *Decium* representent quam suoapte fuerit ingenio.—Plane innuunt, præterquam in *Christianos*, non tam fuisse, quam putatur, *sanguinolentum Decii* imperium.—Demus aliquid superstitioni. At cum ita crederet pro bono reipublicæ in *Christianos* esse sæviendum,* &c.—“*Primum legimus martyrem Fabianum sub finem Januarii. Sub discessum fortasse Decii, nec enim diu ille Romæ est moratus.—Postea paulo plusquam annum intercessit intervallum antequam in Fabiani locum sufficeretur Cornelius. Inde colligimus ea usum esse arte in ecclesiæ persecutione*

GIBSON.

“The virtues of that prince (*Decius*) will scarcely allow us to suspect that he was actuated by a mean resentment against the favourites of his predecessor †, and it is more reasonable to believe, that in the prosecution of his general design to restore the purity of Roman manners, he was desirous of delivering the empire from what he condemned as a recent and criminal superstition.

“The *bishops* of the most considerable cities were removed by exile or death; the vigilance of the magistrates prevented the clergy of Rome, during sixteen months, from proceeding to a new election,” &c ‡.

Our

* Sect. 52.

† We have already seen that *Eusebius*, as here cited, has imputed this persecution “to the *resentment* by which *Decius* was actuated against the favourites of his predecessor.” We have seen that Dodwell also says, “*in odium Philipporum persecutus est Decius*,” sect. 10. Yet our author contradicts their authority, without appealing to any other testimony to prove his assertion.

‡ Page 560.

DODWELL.

secutione Decium qua
usus antea fuerat Maxi-
minus ut in ecclesiæ sa-
cerdotes præcipue perfec-
utionem intentaret,"
&c.—"Et vero totum
opprimendæ Christiani-
tatis præsidium in eo esse
positum à Decio, si sedem
Romæ vacuum servasset,
ex illis nostri martyris
(Cypriani) verbis colli-
gimus quæ scripsit ad
Antonianum. "Multo
"(inquit) *patientius* et
"tolerabilius audisse De-
cium levare adversus se
"emulum principem quam
"constitui Romæ emulum
"sacerdotem." Quorsum
illud, ni gravius aliquod
momentum in ea situm
credidisset Romanæ sedis
vacatione?"

Cyprian. epist. 52.*.

* Sect. 53.

† As Mr. Dodwell observes with regard to the date, "si ta-
men recte tempus consignatum à veterum pontificalium concin-
natoribus;" it was an easy matter from any martyrology or
chronological table to point out a particular day.

‡ Note 121. c. xvi.

§ This citation of Eusebius occurs at section 55. where Dod-
well is speaking of the effects of this persecution in Palestine.

|| Page 560.

** Note 121. c. xvi.

GIBBON.

Our author here makes
the following note :

"The see of Rome re-
mained vacant from the
martyrdom of Fabianus, to
the 20th of January,
A. D. 250 †, till the
election of Cornelius, the
4th of June, A. D. 251.
Decius had probably left
Rome, since he was kill-
ed before the end of that
year ‡."

Euseb. l. vi. c. 39 §.

"It was the opinion
of the Christians, that
the emperor would more
patiently endure a compe-
titor for the purple, than
a bishop in the capital ||."

Cyprian. epist. 55 **.

R 4

Had

Had our author fairly copied from Dodwell, he might have informed us, from sect. 54—57. of the *extent* and *rigour* of this persecution.

XIV.

The administration of *Valerian* is next treated of.

DODWELL.

“Quem (Valerianum) tamen *primis* imperii annis *Christianis amicissimum* fuisse testetur coævus *Dionysius*. Tam fuisse Christianis amicum ait quam fuerint οἱ λεχθέντες ἀναφανδὸν χριστιανοὶ γεγόμεναι. (*Alexandrum*, ni fallor, intelligit atque *Philippus*) quin & illos benevolentia superasse; familiam præterea totam Christianis abundasse, ut ecclesia Dei esse videretur*. Accedebat fortasse & alia ratio.—Quod nempe *magicis operationibus Christiani adversissimi haberentur*.—Ideo *Valerianum Macrianus Magus* ad persecutionem adegit.”

Dionys. Alexand. ap. Hist. Eccles. vii. 10.

GIBBON.

“The administration of *Valerian* was distinguished by a levity and inconstancy, ill suited to the gravity of the Roman censor. In the first part of his reign, he surpassed in clemency those princes who had been suspected of an attachment to the *Christian faith*. In the last three years and a half, listening to the insinuations of a minister addicted to the superstitions of Egypt, he adopted the maxims, and imitated the example of his predecessor *Decius*†.” Euseb. l. vii. c. 10 ‡.

“The mention of those princes who were publicly supposed to be *Christians*, as we find it in an epistle of *Dionysius* of Alexandria (ap. Euseb.

* Sect. 62. p. 296. † P. 560, 561. We have no particular account of this persecution given us by Mr. G. but we find it in Dodwell, sect. 59—63. ‡ Note 122. c. xvi.

GIBBON.

feb. l. vii. c. 10.) evidently alludes to Philip, and his family *."

XV.

Of *Gallienus*, the next emperor, we have this account.

DODWELL.

"Capto *Valeriano* revocavit ejus edicta *Gallienus*, restitutis ubique locis sacris. Extat hodieque ejus rescriptum apud *Eusebium* †." *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 13.*

GIBBON.

"The accession of *Gallienus* restored peace to the church; and the Christians obtained the free exercise of their religion by an edict addressed to the bishops, and conceived in such terms as seemed to acknowledge their office and public character †."—" *Eusebius* (l. vii. c. 13.) gives us a Greek version of this Latin edict, which seems to have been very concise §."

XVI.

The conduct of *Aurelian* is now to be considered.

DODWELL.

"Inde nemo est de persecutione suspectus usque ad *Aurelianum*.—Intentata duntaxat erat ab *Aureliano*, non item executioni mandata. Id satis manifeste indicant scriptores

GIBBON.

"The ancient laws, without being formally repealed, were suffered to sink into oblivion,—some *hostile intentions* are attributed to the emperor *Aurelian* ||.

" *Euseb.*

* Note 118. c. xvi.

† Sect. 63.

‡ Page 561.

§ Note 123. c. xv.

|| P. 561.

DODWELL.

GIBBON.

scriptores illis temporibus proximi, Lactantius & Eusebius.—Similiter Eusebius de eodem Aureliano *.” Lactant. de Mort. Perf. c. 6. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii. 30.

“*Impulsus erat duntaxat Aurelianus ut persecutionem adversus Christianos commoveret, & de ea rumor solum, quasi de re nondum ad exitum perducta ferebatur*†.”—“Sed Eusebio

opposuit (Baronius) quæ scripserat in *Chronico* idem *Eusebius*,” &c. In Chron. Græc. Euseb. ‡.

“Nescio tamen an integrioribus *Hieronimi* codicibus usus fuerit *Orosius*, propius certe accessit ad mentem *Eusebii*,” &c §. Oros. l. vii. c. 23.

* Sect. 64.

† Sect. 64.

‡ P. 300. I have already noted Mr. G's error in quoting the *Chronicon* of *Jerome* instead of *Eusebius*. He was probably led into it by mistaking this passage which I have extracted, though for a cloak he refers to a different edition. Mr. Dodwell is indeed appealed to in these words,

“Most of the moderns (except Dodwell, Dissertat. Cyprian. xi. 64.) have seized the occasion of gaining a few extraordinary martyrs.”

But surely my reader will agree with me, that this is by no means a sufficient acknowledgment for his having *transcribed every one* of his references.

§ Page 301.

|| Note 124. c. xvi.

XVII.

The persecution of *Diocletian* is thus introduced.

DODWELL.

“ Ab *Aureliano* deinde ad *Diocletianum* neminem habent imperatorum de persecutione suspectum.— Sed vero hæc ut omnium longissima erat, ita etiam forte sævissima, certe martyrum proven- tu erat copiosissima. Inde factum ut *Æram Diocle- tiani* recentiores Græci *Æram martyrum* appel- lent *.”

“ Quod itaque per to- tum *hujus* imperium per- secutionem fuisse putent, longe abest ut verum fu- erit. “ *Multa erant* è contra prolixissimæ im- peratorum in Christianos benevolentie indicia. Re- gendas Christianis pro- vincias crediderunt, om- ni sacrificandi metu, qui præfectis provinciarum ex officio imminebat, il- los liberabant. Quin & in ipsis imperatorum pala- tiis, liberi versati sunt. Ipse eorum uxores & li- beri

GIBBON.

“ Amidst the frequent revolutions of the em- pire, the Christians still flourished in peace and prosperity.—A celebra- ted *era of martyrs* has been deduced from the suc- cession of *Diocletian* †.”

“ The principal eu- nuchs,—who attended the person, possessed the favour, and governed the household of *Diocletian*, protected by their power- ful influence the faith which they had em- braced. Their example was imitated by many of the most considerable offi- cers of the palace,—and though it might some- times be incumbent on them to accompany the emperor, when he sacri- ficed in the temple, they enjoyed, with their wives, their children, and their slaves, the free exercise of the Christian religion. *Di- oclitian* and his col- leagues

* Sect. 65.

† Page 563.

DODWELL.

beri & servi erant Christiani."

"His ea quæ religionis suæ erant, tam verbis quam factis libere exequendi coram semet ipsis potestatem dederunt; ipsis ob hanc fidei suæ libertatem gloriari ac se ostentare quodammodo permittentes; eosque præ cæteris omnibus ministris præcipuo quodam amore complectebantur. Id genus exempla aliqua profert Eusebius. Quin & singulis ecclesiarum antistitibus summus honor, cultus ac benevolentia ab omnibus tam privatis quam provinciarum rectoribus delatus est. Innumerabilem præterea hominum quotidie ad fidem Christi confugientium fuisse turbam, immensum ecclesiarum in singulis urbibus numerum, illustres populorum in sacris ædibus concursus, quo factum esset ut *priscis ædificiis jam non contenti in singulis urbibus spatiosas ab ipsis fundamentis*

GIBBON.

leagues frequently conferred the most important offices on them.—The bishops held an honourable rank in their respective provinces, and were treated with distinction and respect, not only by the people but by the magistrates themselves. Almost in every city, the ancient churches were found insufficient to contain the increasing number of proselytes; and in their place more stately and capacious edifices were erected for the public worship of the faithful."

"The leisure of the two empresses, of his wife Prisca, and of Valeria his daughter, permitted them to listen with more attention and respect to the truths of Christianity *."

Lactantius de M. P. c. 15 †.

* P. 564.

† Note 131. c. xvi.

extruerent ecclesias, tradit Eusebius," &c*. Hist. Eccles. viii. 1.

DODWELL.

"Tales (Christianos) fuisse constat *Diocletiani uxorem Priscam, & filiam ejusdem Valeriani, Maximiani autem Galerii uxorem* †." Lactant de Mort. Pers. 15.

Mr. Dodwell then relates the *cause* which Lactantius (de Mort. Pers. n. 10.) gives for *Diocletian's persecution*; "because the Christians interrupted his "religious rites and enquiries into futurity †." But this chapter Mr. G. has unhappily referred to as a proof of the favour of Diocletian to the Christians §.

We thus read of the effects of the persecution :

DODWELL.

"Primum persecutionis gradum in *Milites* fuisse tradit *Eusebius*."

Hist. Eccles. viii. 1**.

"Emissa itaque sunt adversus *milites* persecutionis edicta, nondum tamen *sanguinaria*.—*Pas-*
sos tamen *aliquos*, licet non pro imperatoris edicto,

GIBBON.

"Maximian and Galerius,—in the general administration of the provinces, obeyed the laws which their benefactor had established; but *they frequently found occasions of exercising* within their camps and palaces *a secret persecution*," &c ‖. Euseb. l. viii. c. 4—17.

"He

* Sect. 66. Our author has cited Lactantius only, as if *all this* passage was taken from *him*; whereas we see it is taken from Eusebius, l. viii. c. 1. but he is not quoted till Mr. G. speaks of "the corruption of manners and principles," note 134. Then we read, Eusebius, l. viii. c. 1. &c.

† Sect. 66.

‡ Sect. 68, 69. See also sect. 30.

§ Note 133. c. xvi.

** Sect. 68.

‖ Page 566.

DODWELL.

to, at *pro ministri propria* sævitia, docet *Eusebius*, sed ita docet, ut innuat omnino fuisse paucissimos." *Euseb. Hist. Ecclef. viii. 4.*

"Ego neutra interpretatione *Eusebii* mentem existimo assecutum esse *Valesium*.—Huic itaque persecutionis illius quæ in milites exercenda erat, curam commisit imperator. Ita recte verterit *Hieronymus*. Hos verberibus animadverti iusserat *Diocletianus*. Ex his verberibus nonnullos mortuos fuisse crediderim, quos tamen cum ἐνα πρ καὶ δευτερον et ἐνις dicat *Eusebius*, id palam innuit fuisse paucissimos ||."

"Dimissus à *Diocletiano* *Galerius*—primo vere movit in *Persas*, quos uno prælio penitus debellavit.—Ita ut reversus à *Diocletiano*—cum ingenti honore susceptus fuerit. Rediit—in *Bithyniam*

GIBBON.

"He limits the number of military martyrs by a remarkable expression (σπανίως τούτων ἐς πρ καὶ δευτερος), of which neither his Latin nor French translator have rendered the energy *."

"After the success of the Persian war had raised the hopes and reputation of *Galerius*, he passed a winter with *Diocletian* in the palace of *Nicomedia*; and the fate of Christianity became the object of all their secret consultations. The experienced emperor was still inclined to pursue measures of lenity; and urged, on the strongest terms, the danger as well as cruelty of shedding the blood of those deluded fanatics †."

"The oracle of *Apollo* at *Miletus* was consulted by *Diocletian*, before he published his edicts of persecution. *Lactantius* de M. P. c. 11 †."

"*Galerius*

|| Sect. 69.

* Note 143. c. xvi. How new this remark of Mr. G. is we may surely conjecture, as *Dodwell* censures *Valesius* his French, and *Jerome* his Latin translator, and gives him the words of *Eusebius*.

† Page 567.

† Note 136. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

thyniam hyematum *Diocletianus*.—*Illum secutus est postea Galerius, ut totam illam hyemem consultationibus de persecutione insumserint. Repugnabat diu Diocletianus—cum Galerium desistere non posset; consulti deinde amici, cum etiam Dii, & præ aliis Apollo Milesius*.*—“Hanc tamen moderationem tenere conatus est ut *eam rem sine sanguine transigi juberet, cum Cæsar vivos cremari vellet qui sacrificio repugnassent* †.” Lactant. n. 10, 11.

“Successit fatalis annus *Diocletiani* in quo omnes fere consentiunt initium *decennalis persecutionis* esse collocandum. Vere ineunte, jam conveniebat de persecutione; “inquirebatur” duntaxat (omnis causa) “peragenda rei dies apertus & felix,” tandemque “*terminalia*” delecta sunt,

GIBBON.

Galerius at length extorted from him the permission of summoning a council,—and those ambitious courtiers easily discerned, that it was incumbent on them to second, by their eloquence, the importunate violence of the Cæsar,—Who proposed, that *every one refusing to offer sacrifice should immediately be burnt alive* †.”

“Arguments, like these, may seem to have determined the reluctant mind of Diocletian to embrace a new system of persecution §.”

“The pleasure of the emperor was at length signified to the Christians.—*The twenty-third of February*, which coincided with the Roman festival of the *Terminalia*, was appointed (whether from accident, or design) to set bounds to the progress of Christianity. At the earliest dawn of day, the

* See also sect. 67.

† Sect. 70.

‡ P. 567. 569. Our author has not inserted this passage as it stands connected in Dodwell, but postponed it for a page or two.

§ Page 568.

DODWELL.

sunt, "ut quasi terminus imponeretur Christianæ religionis." Is erat vii. Kal. Mart. Feb. xxiii. Eo itaque die ecclesiam diruebant, scripturas incendebant *Nicomediae*, quod reliquo deinde imperio foret in exemplum. Proximo die Feb. xxiv. edictum *Nicomediae* propositum est, quo, "cavebatur ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate, tormentis subiecti essent ex quocunque ordine aut gradu venirent, adversus eos omnis actio caleret, ipsi non de injuria, non de adulterio, non de rebus ablatiis agere possent, libertatem denique ac vocem non haberent *." Lactantius, de M. P. n.

12, 13.

"Erat & aliud ex Eusebii Testimonio edictum μετ' ου πολυ non multo post superius emissum, quo mandatum est προεδρους omnes ubicumque

GIBBON.

the doors of the church of *Nicomedia* were broke open; and they committed to the flames the volumes of holy scripture †."

"The next day the general edict of persecution was published; persons of a liberal birth were declared incapable of holding any honours or employments. The judges were authorized to hear and to determine every action that was brought against a Christian. But the Christians were not permitted to complain of any injury which they themselves had suffered.—It was enacted, that their churches, in all the provinces of the empire, should be demolished to their foundations ‡."

The governors of the provinces were directed to apprehend all persons of the ecclesiastical order; and the prisons destined for the vilest criminals, were soon

* Sect. 71.

† Page 568.

‡ P. 569, 570.

DODWELL.

que Ecclesiarum, primum quidem ut conjicerentur in vincula, deinde vero ut Diis sacrificare omnibus modis cogerentur. Προσδρων omnes cujuscunque ordinis clericos intellexisse Imperatores, è decreti executione manifestum est. — Pro primo hujus edicti gradu ita carceres fuisse repletos Episcopis, presbyteris, diaconis, lectoribus, atque exorcistis, ut nullus iis qui ob alia crimina condemnati essent, jam locus superesset *, &c. Euseb. viii. 7.

Cruciatibus potiusquam cade sævitum sit, ut qui martyrium passi sunt, eorum plerique ipso cruciatuum dolore extincti fuerint, &c †. Euseb. de Mart. Palæst. c. 2.

Successerunt deinde, si Eusebio credimus, edicta sæviora quibus παν-

GIBBON.

soon filled with a multitude of bishops, presbyters, deacons, readers, and exorcists. By a second edict, the magistrates were commanded to employ every method of severity, which might reclaim them from their odious superstition, and oblige them to return to the established worship of the gods. This rigorous order was extended, by a subsequent edict, to the whole body of Christians, who were exposed to a violent and general persecution †.

At first, indeed, the magistrates were restrained from the effusion of blood; but the use of every other severity was permitted and even recommended to their zeal, &c ‡.

τας πανδημει της κατα πολιν θυειν τε και σπενδειν τοις ειδωλοις εκελευετο. De Mart. Pal. c. 3. §.

* Sect. 72.

† Page 311.

§ Sect. 74.

† Page 574.

‡ Page 572.

DODWELL.

Multos equidem periculo involvebant hujusmodi edicta, cum quicunque synaxibus interfuisent de vita illis esset periclitandum*.

Inde etiam est quod secundo persecutionis anno *purpuram deposuisse Diocletianum* atque *Maximianum* constat è *Lactantio* †. de M. P. n. 19.

secution, he divested himself of the Imperial purple ‖.

GIBBON.

The punishment of death was denounced against all who should presume to hold any secret assemblies for the purpose of religious worship †.

Diocletian had no sooner published his edicts against the Christians, than, as if he had been desirous of committing to other hands the right of per-

XVIII.

After the *resignation of Diocletian*, our author, according to the plan of *Dodwell*, “separately considers the state of Christianity in the different parts of the empire.”

DODWELL.

“Eodem spectat quod, tertio tandem persecutionis anno, persecutionem dicat a Maximino fuisse resuscitatam §.”

“Videamus itaque jam qualis fuerit in reliquis

GIBBON.

“Maximin gratified his own inclination, by yielding a rigorous obedience to the stern commands of his benefactor**.”

“When Galerius had gained

* Page 319.

‖ Page 575.

† Sect. 73.

§ Page 314.

† Page 569.

** Page 579.

DODWELL.

liquis eadem illa persecutio. In *Galerii* imperio omnino probabile est, pro sævissimi principis ingenio, fuisse etiam sævissimam."

GIBBON.

gained the supreme power and the government of the east, he indulged in their fullest extent his zeal and cruelty *."

XIX.

Of *Constantius* we find this account.

DODWELL.

"*Constantium* ab initio amicissimum του καθ' ἡμῶν πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινῶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρέαστους φυλάξαντα· καὶ μὴτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς οἰκῆς καθελόντα μεθ' ἑτέρου τι καθ' ἡμῶν καὶ νεκρῶσαντα tradit *Eusebius* l. viii.

Discrepit nonnihil *Lactantius* †, cujus hæc sunt verba: "*Constantius*, ne dissentire a majorum

GIBBON.

"The mild and humane temper of *Constantius* was averse to the oppression of any part of his subjects. The principal offices of his palace were exercised by Christians.—But as long as *Constantius* remained in the subordinate station of *Cæsar*, it was not in his power openly to reject the edicts of *Diocletian*, or to disobey the commands of *Maximian*. His

* Page 578. † Our author says in a note (164. c. xvi.) *Dodwell* Dissertat. Cyprian. xi. 75. represents them "*(Eusebius and Lactantius)* as inconsistent with each other. "But the former evidently speaks of *Constantius* in the station "of *Cæsar*, and the latter of the same prince in the rank of "*Augustus*." The difference is thus reconciled by *Dodwell* himself.

"Discrepit nonnihil *Lactantius*.—Nec id temere. Infra "enim de *Constantino* jam *Augusto* ita scribit," &c. Mr. D. speaks of the difference as trivial.

DODWELL.

“majorum præceptis videretur, conventicula, id est, parietes, qui restitui poterunt, dirui passus est, verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servabat.” Nec id temere. Infra enim de *Constantio, jam Augusto* ita scribit: “Sulcepto imperio Constantius Augustus nihil egit prius quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo redere. Hæc fuit prima ejus sanctio sanctæ religionis restituta.”—De M. P. c. 14, 15. In eo tamen uterque convenit nullam fuisse quæ martyres fecerit in Constantii ditione persecutionem.—Cuncta autem quæ trans Alpes erant Constantio credita—Ergo non *Britannias* modo, & *Gallias*, sed *Hispanias* regebat †.”

GIBBON.

His authority contributed, however to alleviate the sufferings which he pitied and abhorred. He consented, with reluctance to the ruin of the churches; but he ventured to protect the Christians themselves from the fury of the populace and from the rigour of the laws*.

The *provinces of Gaul* (under which we may probably include those of *Britain*) were indebted for the singular tranquillity which they enjoyed, to the gentle interposition of their sovereign. Eusebius l. viii. c. 13. Lactantius de M. P. c. 15.

The elevation of Constantius to the supreme and independent dignity of Augustus, gave a free scope to the exercise of his virtues, and the shortness of his reign did not prevent him from establishing a system of toleration, &c †.

† Sect. 75.

* Page 575.

† Page 576.

XX.

We read the same account of *Maxentius* in both these authors.

DODWELL.

“ Eodem tempore *desiit* (persecutio) & in *Italia*. *Valedicturus enim imperio Maximianus* eam, ni fallor, gratiam subditis faciebat quo gravior illis acceptiorque esset ejus memoria. Sequiebantur tempora turbulenta usque ad imperium *Maxentii*. Is autem in initio captandæ benevolentiae causa revocavit persecutionis edictum Christianumque se simulavit. — *Hist. Eccles. viii. 14* *.

GIBBON.

“ The revolt of *Maxentius* immediately restored peace to the churches of *Italy* and *Africa*; and the same tyrant who oppressed every other class of his subjects, shewed himself, just, humane, and even partial, towards the afflicted Christians †. *Eusebius, l. viii. c. 14. †.*

Ita *Eusebius* : ”

XXI.

The persecution of *Maximin* is the next which is treated of by them.

DODWELL.

“ Prodiit tandem edictum *Galerii*, quo persecutio illa penitus extincta est—et quanquam invito *Maximino*, a *Sabinio præf. Orientis, præfectis provincialibus urbibusque*

GIBBON.

“ *Galerius* desirous of repairing the mischief that he had occasioned, published—a general edict (of toleration) §.

In the first six months, of his new reign, *Maximin*

* Sect. 77.

§ Page 579.

† Page 577.

‡ Note 167. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

• *cisq̃ue magistratibus communicatum, cum et ipse*
 * *verbo tenus iudicibus mandasset, ut ab oppug-*
natione Christianorum ab-
stinerent. Duravit hæc
 pax ne sex quidem men-
 sibus *—Fatetur à se
 aliquid illis fuisse indul-
 tum *pro more superiorum*
Imperatorum †. Inde ad
 novas artes prætextus-
 que quærendos restau-
 randæ persecutionis se
 convertit *Maximinus.*—
Subornavit civitatum ad
se legationes magni quasi
beneficii loco id à se pe-
tium ut Christiani pelle-
rentur, imprimis Antio-
chiæ, &c. Euseb. Hist.
 Eccles. ix. 3. Tum ci-
 vitates, quæ id gratum
 MAXIMINO fore intellex-
 issent, sua etiam ψνφιο-
 μωτα adversus Christia-
 nos emisertunt. Euseb.
 ix. 9 †

Rescripsit ad illa civi-
 tatum decreta, *pellendos*
esse Christianos. Qualis
 fuerit rescripti forma,
 con-

GIBBON.

imin affected to adopt the
prudent counsels of his
predecessors.—Sabinus his
 prætorian præfect ad-
 dressed a circular letter to
 all the governours and
 magistrates of the pro-
 vinces,—*directing the of-*
ficers of justice to cease
their ineffectual persecu-
tions," &c. Euseb. c.
 ix. 1. §.

But this treacherous
 calm was of a short
 duration.—By the in-
 fluence of the magi-
 strates, and of the la-
 cerdotal order, a great
 number of dutiful ad-
 dresses were obtained,
 particularly from Nico-
 media, *Antioch*, and *Tyre*,
 which artfully repre-
 sented the well known
 intentions of the Court
 as the general sense of
 the people;—expressed
 their abhorrence of *the*
Christians, and humbly
 prayed that these im-
 pious sectaries might at
 least be excluded from the
 limits

• Sect. 82.

† Sect. 82.

† Sect. 84.

§ Page 581. Note 174. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

constat ex eo exemplari quo usus est ad *Tyrios*, quodque *æreis tabulis*, pro more civitatum, *incisum*, tradit *Eusebius*, ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Subjungit enim ejusmodi literas in omnibus provinciis fuisse propositas *. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ix. 7.*

—*Judices* nonnullos in Christianos sæviisse ipse innuit *Maximinus*, sed *præcepta ejus perperam intelligentes*. *Euseb. ix. 10 §.*

GIBBON.

limits of their respective territories.

The answer of *Maximin* to the address which he obtained from the *citizens of Tyre* is still extant—*his edicts were engraved on tables of brass* †. *Eusebius l. ix. c. 2—8. Lactant. de M. P. c. 36 ‡.*

Maximin imputes all the severities which the Christians suffered to the judges and governors, who had misunderstood his intentions. See the Edict in *Eusebius l. ix. c. 10 ||.*

XXII.

We find also that the difference in the accounts given us by *Eusebius* and *Lactantius* of *Maximin's* persecution is pointed out to us by Mr. *Dodwell* as well as by Mr. *Gibbon*.

DODWELL.

Quod autem, ait *Eusebius*, hanc *Maximini* persecutionem priori fuisse multo *acerbiores*, nisi candide intelligatur, *verum esse vix potest*, &c. *Hist.*

GIBBON.

We read in a note.

“ See *Euseb. l. viii. c. 14. l. ix. c. 2—8. Lactant. de M. P. c. 36.* These writers agree in representing the arts of *Max-*

* Page 328. § Sect. 87.

† Note 175. c. xvi.

‡ Page 581, 582.

|| Note 176. xvi.

DODWELL.

Hist. Eccles. ix. 6**.

—Una tamen cum illis rescriptis etiam alia ad præfectos provinciarum iudicesque data esse verisimile est, sed

nec illa eadem imperantia.

“Nam cum clementiam” (inquit Lactantius), “specie tenus” “profiteretur, *occidi servos Dei vetuit*, debilitari” “jussit.” Lactant. de M. P. n. 30*.

GIBBON.

Maximin: but the former relates the execution of several martyrs, while the latter expressly affirms,” *occidi servos Dei vetuit* †.”

We thus read of the end put to Maximin's persecution.

DODWELL.

“Jamque persecutioni matura erant omnia ni *Constantinus illum* (Maximinum) *deterruisset.*

Duravit hæc ipsa dissimulatio (Maximini) usque ad nuncium de *profligato à Constantino Max-*

GIBBON.

“But a few months had scarcely elapsed, before the edicts published by the two western emperors obliged Maximin to suspend the persecution of his designs †.

** Sect. 84. See also sect. 90. 81. 86, 87.

* Sect. 84. Mr. Dodwell, however desirous of making the number of martyrs appear small, has scorn'd to have recourse to those arts of misrepresentation, by which our author supports his Hypothesis. Mr. G. should have remembered that Mr. Dodwell says, “Non itaque audebat palam, quod fecerat antea, (Maximinus) Christianos laniare,” &c.

† No. c. 175. c. xvi.

‡ Page 582.

entio

DODWELL.

entio—inde pro auctoritate egit cum *Maximino Constantinus*.*

XXIII.

There is a striking resemblance in what these authors say of the conduct of the magistrates during this persecution.

DODWELL.

“ Ipsa cædium satietas atque *affectatio* illa quam diximus *incruenti imperii* ad sæviora quidem persecutores consilia, minus tamen martyrum proventu copiosa, convertit.

“ Hæc autem non tantum ideo faciunt, ut gloriari possint, nullum se innocentium peremisse (nam & ipse audiavi aliquos gloriantes, quia ad ministratio sua hac parte fuerit incruenta) sed & invidiæ causa;”
&c. Lactant. Instit. v. 11†.

GIBBON.

“ There were some governours who from a real or affected *clemency* had preserved their hands unstained with the blood of the faithful §.

“ Ut gloriari possint nullum se innocentium peremisse, nam & ipse audiavi aliquos gloriantes, quia ad ministratio sua, in hac parte, fuerit incruenta.” Lactant. Institut. Divin. v. 11. ||.

* Sect. 86.

† Page 332.

‡ Sect. 80.

§ Page 583. || Note 183. c. xvi. Mr. Dodwell has fairly given us the passage from Lactantius; Mr. G. as I have before shewn, has shamefully distorted and mangled it.

Another

XXIV.

Another particular circumstance is noticed by both these writers.

DODWELL.

" Inde anno viii. tanta crevit *Christianis* in *metallis* constitutis fiducia ut palam collectas celebrarent, *extructis etiam Ecclesiis* *."

midst of those dreary habitations †."

GIBBON.

" The confessors who were condemned *to work in the mines*, were permitted by the humanity or negligence of their keepers, *to build chapels*, and freely to profess their religion in the

XXV.

As to the remark on Eusebius with which Mr. G. closes this account of the persecutions; I shall content myself with pointing out a sentence or two and beg leave to refer my reader to Mr. Dodwell for the rest.

DODWELL.

" An tamen *magnus* revera fuerit *martyrum* in hac universa persecutione numerus, ita optime judicabimus, si quos

GIBBON.

" Eusebius, de Mart. tyr. Palestin. c. 13. He closes his narration, by assuring us that these were the martyrdoms inflicted

* Page 326.

† Page 583. Mr. G. does not choose to mention what *Dodwell* says further on this occasion, " Hoc illis novam rursus novi post *Firmilianum* præfæci conflavit invidiam. Inde, consulto imperatore acceptisque rescriptis, quatuor ex omnino numero selectos ipse vivos comburi consumavit 39. Maximino destinavit, quos ille uno eodemque die capitibus truncavit. Reliquos per alia metalla dispersit." p. 326.

DODWELL.

si quos ille *numeros* pro *magnis* habuerit, intelligamus," &c. Euseb. de Mart. Pal. c. 13.

"Videamus—quos ille *numeros* reputarit *mag-nos* in ipsa *Thebaide*—
 ὅτε μὲν πλείονων ἢ δέκα,
 ὅτε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰκοσι—
 ἀλλ' οἷοι δὲ οὐχ' ἥττον καὶ
 τριακοντά. ἤδη δὲ ἐγγύς περὶ
 καὶ ἐξήκοντα, καὶ πάλιν
 ἀλλοτε ἑκατὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ
 — ἐκτείνοντο — ΙΣΤΟΡΗ-
 ΣΑΜΕΝ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ
 τῶν τοσούτων γενομένοι,
 ΠΛΕΙΟΥΣ ἀθροὺς κατὰ
 μιαν ἡμέραν, τῆς μὲν τῆς
 κεφαλῆς ἀποτομὴν ΤΠΟ-
 ΜΕΙΝΑΝΤΑΣ, &c. Eu-
 seb. Hist. Eccles. viii.
 10*."

GIBBON.

inflicted in Palestine, during the whole course of the persecution. The vth chapter of his viiith book, which relates to the province of Thebais in Egypt, may seem to contradict our moderate computation, &c.—He relates, that in Thebais, from ten to one hundred persons had frequently suffered martyrdom in the same day.—Instead of a large, but definite number, he speaks of many Christians (*πλείους*) and most artfully selects two ambiguous words (*ιστορησάμεν* and *υπομεινάντας*) which may signify either what he had seen, or what he had

heard; either the expectation, or the execution of the punishment †."

XXVI.

I shall conclude the whole of these extracts from Dodwell, by pointing out the following observation, which occurs in each of these authors.

DODWELL.

"—Ita metuebant illi (Christiani) ne corona illa

GIBBON.

"So great was—the fervour of the first Christians,

* Sect. 90.

† Note 181. c. xvi.

DODWELL.

illa martyrii exciderent. Sed infinitum esset exempla congerere. Id unum satis est, quod diu est ex quo observavit *Sulpitius Severus*, avidius expetita esse ea ætate martyria quam postea episcopatus *."

GIBBON.

tians, who, according to the lively expression of *Sulpitius Severus*, desired martyrdom with more eagerness, than his own contemporaries solicited a bishopric. †

"Certatim gloriosa in

"certamina ruebatur;

"multique avidius tum

"martyria gloriosis mor-

"tibus querebantur; quam nunc episcopatus pravis
"ambitionibus appetuntur." *Sulpicius Severus*,
l. ii. ‡

There are some other passages in *Dodwell*, which Mr. G. seems to have borrowed; but I have been obliged to dwell so long on this subject, by comparing their words on the conduct of each emperor, that I shall pass over the rest. I flatter myself that I have fully proved to my reader, that the concise account which *Dodwell* has given us of the persecutions of the emperors, has been the chief guide and pattern of our author in this part of his history. It is by his assistance, that he has shewn forth his skill in gracing matters of fact with the beauties of language, while by these beauties he might hope to disguise the many remarks for which he stands indebted to the learning of *Dodwell*. It is thus, that the creeping ivy entwines itself round a tree, and is enabled to display its verdant foliage, while it hides from our sight the trunk which supports it.

* Page 374.

† Page 551.

‡ Note 91. c. xvi. My reader must instantly perceive that it was no hard task to trace out the passage of *Sulpicius*, when so much was marked out by *Dodwell*.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism from LARDNER.

I have already animadverted on a misrepresentation of Eusebius by Mr. G., and shewn that there is no mention made of *Bruttius Præfens* at the place he refers to. My present design is to fulfil my promise of shewing the probable cause of this error.

Dr. Lardner, in his xiith chapter on the Testimony of *Bruttius Præfens*, refers to Eusebius iii. 18.; but yet speaks of *Bruttius* as mentioned by Eusebius in his *Chronicon*. p. 164. in the 15th year of Domitian. This difference our historian seems to have overlooked, and referred to the *History*, instead of the *Chronicon*.

LARDNER.

“Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, speaking of the persecution under Domitian, says, “Moreover at this time the Doctrine of our faith “was so conspicuous, that writers, adverse to our “sentiments, have not forbore to insert in their “histories an account of his persecution, and the “martyrdoms that happened in it.”

LARDNER.

“They have likewise exactly marked the time of it, relating, that “in “the fifteenth year of “Domitian *Flavia Domitilla*, niece by the “sister’s side to *Flavius Clemens*, then one of “the consuls of Rome, “with a great many

GIBBON.

“The emperor (Domitian) for a long time distinguished *Flavius Clemens* by his favour and protection, bestowed on him his own niece *Domitilla*—and invested him “with the honours of the “consulship.

“others

LARDNER.

"others, was banished to the island *Pontia*, for the profession of the Christian religion *."

LARDNER.

"In his chronicle, at the fifteenth year of Domitian, *Eusebius* says: "And *Bruttius* writes, "that many Christians suffered martyrdom under Domitian. "Among whom was "Flavia Domitilla, niece "by the sister's side to "*Flavius Clemens* the consul, who was banished "to the island *Pontia*, because she confessed herself to be a Christian †."

"There were several eminent men of this name (that is *Bruttius Præsens*) in the second century. There is a letter of the younger *Pliny* to *Præsens*, whom some think to have been also called *Brutius* or *Bruttius*." l. vii. epist. 3.

Tillemont says, "he may have been *Bruttius Præsens*, who was consul in the year 139. or *Præ-*

GIBBON.

"But he had scarcely finished the term of his annual magistracy, when on a slight pretence he was condemned and executed; *Domitilla* was banished to a desolate island on the coast of *Campania*," &c ‡.

"*Bruttius Præsens* (ap. *Euseb.* iii. 18.) banishes her to the isle of *Pontia*, which was not far distant from the other §." That is, from the isle of *Pandetaria*.

"If the *Bruttius Præsens*, from whom it is probable that he collected this account, was the correspondent of *Pliny*, (epistol. vii. 3.) we may consider him as a contemporary writer ||."

* The Greek passage is here transcribed by Lardner from *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* l. iii. c. 18.

† *Chron.* p. 164.

‡ Page 539.

§ Note 53. c. xvi.

|| Note 53 c. xvi.

sens,

LARDNER.

sens, to whom the younger Plinie wrote : though, as he adds, there were others of the same name about that time."

LARDNER.

Again we read, "Dion Cassius, to be hereafter quoted, will inform us of a *Flavia Domitilla*, wife of the consul *Clement*, who was banished by *Domitian* for Christianity into the island *Pandeteria*, which lay near to *Pontia*, upon the same coast of *Italic*. This has given occasion to a dispute whether there were two of this name, who suffered for Christianity about the

same time. Some supposing one and the same person to be intended, others again contending, that there were two. The matter is of no great importance. Nevertheless, perhaps, we may give it some farther consideration, in the chapter of *Dion Cassius*." *Tillemont Mem. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 126, 127* *.

GIBBON.

"*Domitilla* was banished, according to *Dion*, to the isle of *Pandataria*.—That difference, and a mistake either of *Eusebius*, or of his transcribers, have given occasion to suppose two *Domitillas*, the wife and the niece of *Clemens*. See *Tillemont Memoires Ecclesiastiques*, tom. ii. p. 224 †."

We here trace the several remarks which our historian has made on the execution of *Clemens*, on the banishment of *Domitilla*, and on *Bruttius Præsens* : And as he makes mention of them in the manner, and on the same occasion which *Dr. Lard-*

* *Lardner's Testimonies—Heathen Authors*, vol. ii. c. 12.

† *Note 52. c. xvi.*

ner has done, it gives my charge an appearance more stable than that of conjecture.

Plagiarisms from ABAUZIT.

I bring the first instance, not so much as a proof of plagiarism, for our author has indeed referred to Abauzit, as to shew how servilely he has translated him, and that *Abauzit* has given him the reference to *Epiphanius*.

ABAUZIT.

“ *Les Alogiens, selon S. Epiphane, s'éleverent contre l'Apocalypse qu'ils vouloient ôter à S. Jean, parce disoient-ils entr'autres raisons, que du tems de cet apôtre, il n'y avoit point d'Eglise Chrétienne à Thyatire : ce que S. Epiphane ne craint point de leur accorder, & il suppose en même tems, que lorsque S. Jean écrit à l'Eglise de Thyatire, il parle, non comme si elle existoit alors, mais par un esprit de prophétie.*”
Epiphane Hæres. 51*.

GIBBON.

“ *The Alogians (Epiphanius de Hæres. 51.) disputed the genuineness of the Apocalypse, because the church of Thyatira was not yet founded. Epiphanius, who allows the fact, extricates himself from the difficulty, by ingeniously supposing, that St. John wrote in the spirit of prophecy. See Abauzit Discours sur l'Apocalypse†.*”

* Discours Historique sur l'Apocalypse.

† Note 152. c. xv.

I.

A bare comparison will prove, that what our author has advanced on the subject of the Apocalypse is chiefly taken from *Abauzit*.

ABAUZIT.

“ Mais ce qui prouve que l'Apocalypse n'étoit pas dans le canon des écritures, c'est le concile de Laodicée, le premier que nous connoissons qui ait dressé le catalogue des livres sacrés, tenu vers

l'an 360.—L'Apocalypse y

est omise, ce qui est assés surprenant, elle que S. Jean (comme on le croit aujourd'hui,) avoit rédigée par écrit à la prière des Chrétiens d'Asie.—Cette même Apocalypse est méconnue dans le lieu de sa naissance, bannie & proscrire par ces mêmes évêques d'Asie qui se disoient les héretiers & les successeurs de S. Jean, assemblés à Laodicée, au milieu des sept Eglises à qui le livre étoit adressé, & à qui il rendoit même un si glorieux témoignage.”

GIBBON.

“ In the council of Laodicea (about the year 360) the Apocalypse was tacitly excluded from the sacred canon by the same churches in Asia to which it is addressed.”

II.

ABAUZIT.

“ On ne sauroit non plus faire fonds sur une petite vivacité de *Sulpice Sévère*, lorsqu'il traite de sous & d'impies ceux qui rejettent l'Apocalypse.—Faut-il être surpris que Sévère ait taxé de folie & d'impiété ceux qui

doutoient de l'Apocalypse ? Mais ce qui est plus à

GIBBON.

“ We may learn from the complaint of Sulpicius Severus, that their sentence had been ratified by the greater number of Christians of his time.”

remarquer,

T

ABAUZIT.

remarquer, c'est que ces foux & ces impies faisoient le plus grand nombre. *La plupart* dit Sévère, *rejettent l'Apocalypse,*" &c. *

The above extract from Abauzit evidently proves, that I happened to discover the right passage, when I pointed out Mr. G.'s misrepresentation of *Salpicius Severus*; and at the same time it demonstrates the reason that he did not make any particular reference to that author. Abauzit had not specified the place, and as Mr. G. consulted no other original, he knew not how to give us a better direction. Indeed if he had looked at the passage, and found that *Sulpicius Severus* there expressly tells us, that *the Apocalypse was the work of St. John*, he could not have committed so unfortunate a blunder as to cite this Father as saying that *the greater number of Christians* denied its canonical authority.

III.

ABAUZIT.

GIBBON.

"Environs ce tems-là, un Grec inconnu se couvroit du beau nom de S. Denys l'Aréopagite, pour donner à ses fictions le poids & l'âge de la vérité.—Cependant comme la supposition étoit grossière, elle ne fût pas d'abord goûtée dans son pays natal: mais elle trouva un climat plus favorable en occident. Papes,

"The Greeks were subdued by the authority of an impostor, who, in the sixth century, assumed the character of Dionysius the Areopagite †."

* Sect. 81, p. 297, 298.

† Note 65, c. xv.

ABAUZIT.

conciles, souverains, la reçurent avec grand respect, & le monde Latin admira la profonde doctrine du prétendu Areopagite*.

I had passed over this reason which Mr. Gibbon assigns for the reception of the Apocalypse in the Greek church; because, as he had cited no testimony for his assertion, it was foreign to my purpose to take notice of his remark: But now I have more effectually proved my point by shewing whence he gained his information.

In the advertisement prefixed to *Abauzit's* discourse on the Apocalypse it is very frankly acknowledged, that "he undertook it with the view of pointing out the difficulties that may be raised against it, and the contests occasioned by a doubt of its authenticity, and to overthrow the testimony of the Fathers concerning it." We need not wonder, therefore, that our author should readily adopt his remarks, nor, after so long a series of Plagiarisms as I have exposed, that he should endeavour to conceal his obligations.

From *Dr. Middleton's letter to Dr. Waterland*, our author has gained the subsequent passage:

MIDDLETON.

"*Herodotus* tells us,—
"that the Phœnicians
"and Syrians who inhabited
"Palestine, (that is,
"the Jews) confessed, that
"they had received the
"custom of circumcision
"from

GIBBON.

"*Herodotus*, who visited Asia whilst it obeyed the last of those empires, slightly mentions the Syrians of Palestine, who, according to their own confession, had received

* Sect. 93. p. 306, 307.

MIDDLETON.

“from the Egyptians.”

Vid. Herod. l. 2. c.

104 *.”

GIBBON.

ceived from Egypt the rite
of circumcision.”

See l. 2. c. 104 †.

Our author has adopted many of Dr. Middleton's opinions respecting the Jews; I shall give one specimen.

MIDDLETON.

“The Jews, on the other hand, were an obscure contemptible people, famed for no kind of literature; scarce known to the polite world, till the Roman empire dispersed them; and then the more despised only for being known.”

Tacit. Hist. v. 3.

Justin. Hist. l. 36. c.

2. ‡

GIBBON.

The Jews, who under the Assyrian and Persian monarchies, had languished for many ages the most despised portion of their slaves, emerged from obscurity under the successors of Alexander; and—soon excited the curiosity and wonder of other nations §.”

Tacit. Hist. v. 1—9.

Justin. 36. 2, 3 ||.

It

* Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 26.

See the refutation of this opinion by the late Bp. Pearce in his *Reply to the Letter to Dr. Waterland*, p. 13.

† Note 1. c. xv.

§ Page 451.

|| Note 2. c. xv.

‡ P. 29. Letter to Dr. Waterland.

I have already fully shewn the assistance Mr. G. has received from the *Free Inquiry* of his friend Dr. Middleton; yet great as his opinion is of him, it has not prevailed on our historian to profit by his admonition. Speaking of the infidel author of “*Christianity as old as the Creation*,” he says, “And this may serve withal to shew his ignorance of antiquity, in magnifying, as he does on all occasions, the moderation of pagan governments, in opposition to Christian; that they indulged an universal liberty, never persecuted for religion, never quarrelled”

“led

It was agreeable to our author's design to adopt such a dark character of the Jews: He indeed discovers his inclinations by the choice of his authors.

After so long a detail of convincing proofs, I think no doubt can remain, that our author, with all his pretensions to originality, must stand convicted as a servile plagiarist. Nor let any one fancy, that it cost him much labour or skill to make such a display of erudition: nothing more was requisite than to drop one single link of the chain; to omit mentioning the name of his modern friends, through whose channel he had any acquaintance with the ancient writers on the subjects he treated of, and to make the boldest and most frequent appeals to those ancients, as if he himself had painfully turned over all their works. I have, I hope, sufficiently established the certainty of this his mode of proceeding; but I cannot dismiss this charge against him without informing the reader, that in one instance, by an unaccountable oversight, he has, unfortunately for himself, forgot to drop the modern, and modestly disclaims all knowledge of *Athanasius*, but what he has picked up from *Tillemont*.

TILLEMONT.

“ Dieu fit aussi eclater à la honte des mauvais Chrétiens la generosité de quelques infideles, qui

GIBBON.

“ Heavy penalties were denounced against all who should presume to save a proscribed secretary

“ *led about their Gods*; for he quite mistakes the matter; it is “ *not the believers of religion, but infidels and atheists, who in every country have always been the severest persecutors, and the cruellest oppressors of all civil as well as religious liberty.*” He proves his assertion by several examples. Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 54. See also p. 64.

TILLEMONT.

qui ayant reçu chez eux des Chrétiens que l'on cherchoit, eurent aiant de soin de les cacher qu'ils en eussent pu avoir pour eux-mêmes, & ne craignirent point de perdre de l'argent, de souffrir la prison, & de s'exposer même à la mort, plutost que de trahir ceux qui s'estoient confiés à leur foy." Athanas. solit. p. 253 *.

GIBSON.

tary from the just indignation of the Gods, and of the emperors. Yet notwithstanding the severity of this law, the virtuous courage of many of the pagans, in concealing their friends or relations, affords an honourable proof, that the rage of superstition had not extinguished in their minds the sentiments of nature and humanity †."

Athanasius, p. 833. ap. Tillemont Memoires Ecclesiastiques, tom. v. part 1. p. 90 ‡.

These proofs of our author's plagiarism which I have produced, as undeniable as they are numerous, I might still extend, by tracing him more closely. But I trust that I have sufficiently convinced every unbiaſſed person, within how narrow a compass the boasted extent of Mr. G.'s reading is contained. It might be very proper to present his readers with a body of notes, stuffed with a disgusting farrago of ancient learning; but he could employ his time better than by really examining the musty Fathers, whose writings he so frequently appeals to. *Middleton* could afford some topics of abuse; *Barbeyrac* had others ready prepared for his purpose; and *Dodswell*, in one dissertation, had collected erudition enough to furnish the far

* Tillemont Mem. Eccles. tom. v. p. 55. 4to. edit.

† Page 575.

‡ Note 163. c. xvi.

greater

greater part of the materials for his sixteenth chapter. And I think I may boldly assert, that if I had added *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, and *Dupin's Bibliotheque*, to my list of Mr. G.'s modern friends, I should hardly have left him a single sentence of his own to boast of in his two famous chapters, which were to give the death-wound to Christianity. In short, were I to restore to each of them the passages which Mr. G. has purloined, he would appear as naked as the proud and gaudy daw in the fable, when each bird had plucked away his own plume. The witty poet tells us what censure such proceedings merit,

———“*Moveat cornicula risum*
“*Furtivis nudata coloribus.*”——

I have now completed the task I proposed to execute; which was not to confute Mr. G.'s arguments against the divine original of Christianity; but to expose the indefensible arts to which he has recourse in supporting them; and to strip them of their boasted novelty, by restoring his pilfered erudition to their proper owners. Before I conclude, however, it may not be without its use to quiet the apprehensions of many a sincere, but, I must add, ill-instructed Christian, who, imposed upon by our historian's parade of quotation and elegance of composition, have done him, what I must think, the unmerited honour of considering him as an adversary who had produced something of importance, unknown to his predecessors in the cause of infidelity, and which the friends of the Gospel would find it difficult to confute.—Be it observed, therefore, that Mr. G. does not give

* *Mosheim, de rebus Christianorum ante Constantin. M.*

himself the trouble of starting any new objection against the truth of Christianity, but that his whole plan of *accounting for its progress from secondary causes* is a stale infidel topic, urged and confuted long before he was born*. As a proof of this, the reader will, I believe, thank me for the following extract from a sermon of bishop Atterbury.

“*Miraculous* it certainly was (to use the bishop’s words), because the *natural* and visible causes which concurred to the production of this great effect, were not any ways equal to the effect produced; and therefore, some *supernatural* and invisible cause must needs have given birth to it.

“But let us hear what causes, they say, conspired together to produce this wonderful effect.” From the weakness and insufficiency of these the bishop thus deduces the proof of the miraculous propagation.

“In which truth (viz. the miraculous propagation of the Gospel) that we may be yet farther confirmed, let us consider what *shifts* the enemies of the gospel make use of, to evade the force of

* The following concise passages from *Mr. Steele*, (who is spoken of so highly on many occasions by our historian,) may with propriety be given to my readers, to shew that his sentiment on this subject is as widely different from Mr. G.’s, as it is more rational, more pious, and more grateful. They are thus translated by *Maclaine*.

“When we consider the rapid progress of Christianity among the Gentile nations, and the poor feeble instruments by which this great and amazing event was immediately effected, *we must naturally have recourse to an omnipotent and invisible hand, as its true and proper cause,*” &c.

“Such then were the *true causes* of that amazing rapidity with which the Christian religion spread itself upon the earth; and those who pretend to assign other reasons of this surprizing event, *indulge themselves in idle fictions*, which must disgust every attentive observer of men and things.” Sect. 8. 1c.

this

this pressing argument. And the utmost that any of them pretend to say, is as follows : It is true, they will own, Christians multiplied very fast, and the increase of them was, in some sense, *miraculous* : That is, it was *wonderful* ; as every unusual thing is to those, who do not know, or consider the causes of it. But to a man, they say, who dares go out of the common road, and to think for himself, it will appear, that there was at that time a set of *natural* causes on foot, sufficient to account for this effect, without any recourse to a *divine* and *supernatural* agent. The apostles indeed were twelve plain illiterate men, who had not, of themselves, force or skill enough, to bring about such an event : But their natural inability was supplied by a favourable juncture, by a happy coincidence of such conspiring causes, and accidental advantages, as mightily helped on the work.

“ For example——

“ The *purity of the Christian morals* was a mighty argument to bring the men of probity and virtue into the interests of the Gospel.

“ The *distribution of goods*, which the first Christians made, and their living together in common, was a good reason for many men's embracing that faith, which, they were sure, would maintain them.—In the mean while, the *rulers* of the world *overlooked*, and *neglected to crush*, a doctrine, which was so harmless in itself, and so unlikely to succeed on the account of its abettors ; till, through their connivance, it was at last universally received among the vulgar sort, and the number of its votaries was grown so formidable, that even princes themselves were forced, for their own ease and interest, to come into it, and profess it.

“ And thus, say they, several extraordinary and unheeded advantages concurring to favour the growth of Christianity, it *grew* indeed *mightily*, and *prevailed* ;

prevailed; as a little river will swell high, and spread itself wide, and run far, when swoln by casual rains, and by many other streams, which have emptied themselves at once into it. Such is the account they pretend to give of the rise and progress of our faith, from *second causes*, without calling a *first*, to solve the appearance.

“ The *purity of the Christian morals*, and the answerable lives of Christian converts, did indeed very naturally lead men to admire and value the doctrine of Christ, but by no means to come under the yoke of it: for though most men have an esteem for strict rules, and strict lives; yet few care to practise the one, or to imitate the other. And nothing, I think, could be contrived so effectual (next to the former wise motive from the sufferings of the martyrs) to *deter* men from Christianity, as to tell them, that, when they took it upon them, they must renounce their dearest appetites and passions, and deny their very selves. And I desire the men, who raise these objections against the divine original of the Gospel, to tell us fairly, whether, if they had lived at that time, they would have come in upon *this* principle? I am sure they would not; because it is *this* principle alone (that they must part with their unlawful satisfactions and pleasures, if they do) which keeps them out of it now. Therefore neither can this be any sufficient reason for the sudden and wide growth of Christianity.

“ Again, neither can any probable account be given of this matter, from the *charitable distribution of their goods, which the first Christians made*. For, supposing that some of the poorer sort might be tempted by this motive; yet, surely, those who had wherewithal to sustain themselves, and were easy in their circumstances, did not come in upon it: It will not be said, I hope, that such as *made* this

this distribution of their goods (which will be found to have been an inconsiderable number) came in themselves to *partake* of it. Nor could these hopes have any great influence, even on the meaner sort; since there was something in the Christian religion, of far more force to frighten them, than this was to allure them; the strict rules of honesty and temperance, according to which they were bound to live, and the great calamities and persecutions which they were sure to undergo.

“ Lastly, No weight can be laid in this case, on that *contempt*, which the *heathen princes* are said to have had of the *Christian religion*, and the little care they, therefore, took to restrain it: for it is not true, that they stood by unconcerned at it's growth; on the contrary, it is certain, that they looked upon it with a jealous eye, from its first rise; and the early persecutions of *Nero* (not to mention those of *Domitian*, which were after the destruction of *Jerusalem*) shew that he took great notice of it, and endeavoured to extirpate it. However, let the Roman emperors have been never so regardless of its increase; yet it is certain, that they did no ways countenance it; and that every one, who turned Christian, was sure by that means to forfeit the favour of his prince, and to be looked upon as an apostate from the religion of his country. And how, even under such a pressure as this, could Christianity have made so rapid and astonishing a progress, if He, who is mightier than the mightiest, had not bid it *go forth and prosper* against all human discouragements? Had *this counsel*, or *this work* been of *Men*, it would, even without any direct opposition from the temporal power, have certainly *come to nought*, as *Gamaliel* argued; *but being of God, nothing could overthrow it.*

" I do not deny after all, but that every one of these particulars might in a natural way contribute somewhat, either to the planting, or spreading of the Gospel. But I think it is evident, from the short hints I have suggested to you, that all of them together were not able to do the thousandth part of that work, which is allotted to them. And, therefore, to resolve this great event into a *conspiracy of second causes*, as it is called, without any regard to the *first*, is an *absurd and senseless attempt*; and only shews us, how very strong an inclination and bias there is in some minds towards *infidelity*, which they can be brought to espouse upon so very slight grounds.

" A man, who should see an acorn put into the earth, and perceive in a few weeks, or months, an oak shooting up from it to a prodigious height, and spreading its branches to an amazing extent, so as to overtop the loftiest mountains, and even to cover the whole field where it grew; might as well say, that there was a *strange conspiracy of natural causes*, an extraordinary degree of warmth, moisture, and so forth, which concurred to produce this effect; as affirm, that the vast success of the Gospel was owing to those *petty principles*, from whence some men pretend to derive it*."

And now, upon a review of the charges which I have urged against Mr. G., I think I cannot better address him than in the words of bishop Pearce, on a similar occasion, to Dr. Middleton.

" By this time, Sir, the reader I believe has fully seen how little credit your writings deserve in their appeals to the authors which you cite†.—You have hardly made one *original* quotation of an author in his true sense, very often in the sense most

* Bp. Atterbury, *serm.* iii. vol. i.

† Reply to the Defence of a Letter to Dr. Waterland, p. 46.

opposite to his true one; and *have represented not only passages, but facts too, in so wrong a light*, that, whatever you searched for, it is plain you missed of truth †.—But in God's name, Sir, is any cause worth such a proceeding? can a good one want falsehoods? or does a bad one deserve them? Let facts, of whatever kind, be sifted thoroughly, and examined freely; but let impartiality always go along with the search, and let it always be thought one ingredient in free-thinking, to follow truth in every inquiry: He that suffers himself to be imposed upon, or tries to impose upon others, has no right to the title of a free-thinker ‡.”

With what justice I have applied these words to our author, I leave those to determine who have perused my Examination. One would think that Mr. G. had deemed his studied elegance of style alone sufficient to compensate for unfair quotation and false assertion. But surely it is not the lengthened period, the flow of polished words, the harmonious diction, which can of themselves constitute the character of a good historian. These indeed serve to amuse the fancy, and delight the ear: Yet they conduce little to our information or instruction; but, rather, beguile the judgment of the unwary. It is *the indispensable duty* of an historian, to give a fair and impartial relation of facts, and to support this relation by citing the testimony of credible authors. I might add to this, that accuracy and impartiality are peculiarly requisite in a writer whose subject leads him to enter upon an investigation of the truth of religion, which is so intimately connected with the most important interests of mankind.

“The historian,” says the ingenious and elegant author of the History of America, “who deline-

† Reply to a Letter to Dr. W. p. 7.

‡ Ibid. p. 40.

ates the transactions of a remote period, has *no title to claim assent*, unless he produces evidence in proof of his assertions. Without this, he may write *an amusing tale*, but cannot be said to have composed an authentic history." Excellent and just reflection! how unhappily applied to Mr. Gibbon!

"In these sentiments," continues Dr. Robertson, "I have been confirmed by the opinion of an author, (Mr. Gibbon) whom his industry, erudition, and discernment, have deservedly placed in a high rank among the most eminent historians of the age*."

Will the reader of the foregoing sheets agree with the Doctor in his compliment? What *industry* can Mr. G. lay claim to, whose researches, we see, notwithstanding all his pretences, have been lazily confined within so narrow a circle? What *erudition* can he boast of, whom we have convicted of inaccuracies so striking as to be scarcely pardonable in any one who would pass for a scholar? And what *discernment* can he be said to possess, who, not satisfied with "being placed in a high rank among the most eminent historians of the age," chose to relinquish that superiority of fame, and to be handed down to posterity, as a very insidious, but a very superficial advocate of infidelity, the retailer of obsolete sneers against sacred truths, the misrepresenter of venerable antiquity, and the plagiary of modern compilers?

Mr. G. has indeed written "*a tale amusing*" enough to Unbelievers and Free thinkers, but "*he cannot be said to have composed an authentic history: he has no title to claim assent, unless he produces evidence in proof of his assertions.*" What pity is it then that the *reverend* and *courty* historian, through politeness, should have made a

* See the preface to Dr. Robertson's History of America.

needless digression, to bestow *applause*, before he had examined whether *censure* was not rather due?

I mean not to represent *Dr. Robertson* as singular in this high tone of compliment to *Mr. Gibbon*. He has only spoken the language of others who have professedly answered him.

May I be permitted, before I conclude, to hazard it as my opinion, that this civility has been carried beyond all due bounds; and that our historian is entirely indebted for his supposed eminence among the enemies of the gospel, to the over candid encomiums of some of its friends? When men of learning, and good Christians, tell us, that he is "respectable for his *great merits*, "*—of real eminence in learning as well as composition**,—and *applaud the erudition with which the materials* (of his history) *are compiled*†," it consequently elevates his fame, and bestows upon him an unmerited consequence, which may puzzle the ignorant, and seduce the unwary believer. It is thus that the credulous superstition of former ages, arising from their ignorance of philosophy, attributed to the glaring comets a malignant influence, and caused them to be viewed with a groundless horror as tokens of impending danger.

* When we reflect on the great credit, which has been given to Mr. G. chiefly, for his elegance of style, we may justly apply to him the words of Bp. Jewell. "*Ut cum eleganter et copiose ageretur, homines imperiti possent in eâ aliquid esse suspicari.*" Juell. Apolog. pro Eccles. Anglican.

† The same author, who pays Mr. G. these compliments, tells us, that "he has adopted an entertaining but *superficial* manner of writing history," and agrees with me, that he "gives himself the privilege of *mutilating*, and selecting, and *arranging at discretion*, the records of past ages."

I shall

I shall now only add, that nothing but the evident goodness of my cause, and the undeniable weakness of Mr. Gibbon's assertions, could have encouraged me to undertake this examination. But as my plan required nothing more than to have recourse to the authors he cites (with which the copious stores of learning treasured up at *Oxford*, and the kindness of some private friends, amply furnished me), and merely to transcribe their words; *diligence and accuracy* were the principal qualifications for engaging in such a task; nor was the judgment of riper years so necessary to enable me to execute it successfully.

Let me now take my leave of Mr. Gibbon by assuring him, that if, in the warmth of composition, I have made use of any expressions too harsh and severe, it is entirely owing to the indignation I could not but feel, to see him perpetually vilifying the most venerable and sacred truths with contemptuous irony. I could wish to advise him (would he accept of such humble counsel), when he favours us with his next volume, to keep close to his department as an historian, and to drop the character of a champion of infidelity, which, he may now find, has not added to his literary fame. In the prosecution of his plan, it will fall naturally in his way to treat of the *corruptions* of Christianity; and as his *diligence and accuracy* will find ample materials for accounting for the rise and progress of *popery* from *natural causes*, we trust that he will not continue to attack genuine Christianity; at least, that he will, for the future, beware of such arts as have been sufficiently exposed in the foregoing sheets.

F I N I S.